

# **Army Community Support Programs and Army Families: A Review of the Findings**

**Walter R. Schumm**  
Kansas State University

**D. Bruce Bell**  
U.S. Army Research Institute

**Giao Tran**  
American University  
Consortium Research Fellows Program

**Organization and Personnel Resources Research Unit**  
**Paul A. Gade, Chief**

September 1998



U.S. Army Research Institute  
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19981021 018

**U.S. Army Research Institute  
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

**A Directorate of the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command**

**EDGAR M. JOHNSON  
Director**

---

Research accomplished under contract  
for the Department of the Army

Kansas State University

Technical review by

Joseph Psotka

**NOTICES**

**DISTRIBUTION:** This Research Note has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) to comply with regulatory requirements. It has been given no primary distribution other than to DTIC and will be available only through DTIC or the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

**FINAL DISPOSITION:** This Research Note may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

**NOTE:** The views, opinions, and findings in this Research Note are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other authorized documents.

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) September 1998		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (from... to) 1985 - 1989	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Army Community Support Programs and Army Families: A Review of the Findings				5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER MDA903-87-C-0540	
				5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 63007A	
				5c. PROJECT NUMBER 792	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Walter R. Schumm (Kansas State University), D. Bruce Bell (ARI), and Giao Tran (American University)				5d. TASK NUMBER 2302	
				5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER C2	
				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences ATTN: TAPC-ARI-RP 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600					
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600				10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI	
				11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Research Note 98-31	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words):  <p>During the late 1980's soldiers and family members were asked a series of questions about the Army's social and recreational services in four world-wide surveys: the DoD Family Survey (1985), The Annual Survey of Army Families (1987), The RAND Corporation Survey (1987), and the Army Family Research Program or AFRP Survey (1989). Specifically, the respondents were asked whether they used given services, were satisfied with it, and what benefits they derived from such services. The purpose of this report is to provide insights into what these services actually do by contrasting what different groups of respondents (e.g., officers, enlisted soldiers, and spouses) and different surveys say about these services. In addition to summarizing the findings, the report also makes recommendations (where appropriate) for how to improve given services.</p> <p>General community services have much higher use than do the more "clinical" or services that are "targeted" to a special group. In general, spouses are more likely than soldiers to use Army services. Soldiers who used services were more likely to see their leaders as supportive of families than those who did not. Retention intentions were also related to satisfaction with the community, particularly among junior enlisted personnel.</p>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS community services    social services    family services    soldier retention    quality of life					
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  Unlimited	20. NUMBER OF PAGES  83	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Name and Telephone Number) D. Bruce Bell 703/617-8867
16. REPORT Unclassified	17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified			

## FOREWORD

---

Approximately 12% of the Army's total budget is spent on community and recreational programs. The most obvious justification for having such programs is that Army installations, like other American "towns" are expected to provide the entire range of human services Americans have come to enjoy: housing, school, recreational facilities, and human services. This "reason" for the services is part of the larger and more historic Army value: "the Army takes care of its own." In recent years, the Army has also been looking at the benefits to the institution (e.g., they increase soldier retention).

This report summarizes what we learned about the utility of Army community services from four world-wide surveys that were conducted in the late 1980s as part of a major effort in the Army to examine the entire Army family support system. Although more recent data now exists, this report provides rich comparisons between what different groups of "customers" (i.e., soldiers and their spouses) say about the services and provides baseline data to be used in both research and program development.

The report was originally developed in 1993 as part of the U.S. Army Research Institute's six year (1986-1992), programmatic family research effort known as the Army Family Research Program (AFRP).

Zita M. Simutis  
Technical Director



# Army Community Support Programs and Army Families: A Review of Findings

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Research Requirement:

The purpose of this report is to determine how well Army community services are working and to formulate recommendations for improving these service systems.

### Procedure:

The authors reviewed the findings from four worldwide surveys that focused on social and recreational services that were delivered to soldiers and their families by the military. These surveys and the respondents who completed them were: (1) the 1985 DoD family survey (Service members from all four military services and their spouses), (2) the 1987 Annual Survey of Army Families (Army spouses), (3) the 1987 RAND Corporation survey (soldiers and their spouses), and (4) the 1989 Army Family Research Program survey (soldiers and their spouses). The review included a total of 27 reports from the four surveys and 17 reports from other sources that added background or context for the findings.

### Findings:

Army services were divided into four groups in terms of frequency of use and levels of satisfaction with services rendered. Services high in use and satisfaction tended to be those which attempted to serve all soldiers and spouses. Examples of these programs included recreation and normal "city" type functions (e.g., grocery stores, libraries, and Army Community Service).

High use, low satisfaction programs included: services for handicapped family members, child daycare, housing, education, banking, the Post Exchange, and family support groups. One common element in many of these types of services was an element of time delay in service delivery that could be addressed by making the services more available or efficient.

Low use, high satisfaction programs seemed to be quality programs that were, for the most part, only useful to a small segment of the Army population. Examples of this type of program are: directories of community services, information and referral services, arts and crafts, music and theater, financial and emergency services, youth employment programs, singles recreational programs, child abuse services, and treatment and counseling programs. Some of these programs could be expected to reach a wider segment of the population if they had better publicity.

Low use, low satisfaction programs included: relocation counseling, sponsorship for junior enlisted personnel, and spouse employment programs. These programs appear to be

candidates for restructuring since most of them appear to have more potential clients than they are reaching.

In general, spouses were more likely than soldiers to use Army services. Soldiers who used services were more likely to see their leaders as supportive of families than those who did not. Retention intentions were also related to satisfaction with the community, particularly among junior enlisted personnel.

#### **Utilization of Findings:**

A draft version of this report and accompanying briefing was shared with the Directorate of Human Resources in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and with the staff of the U. S. Army Community and Family Support Agency in 1992. The final version will also be made available to the current program managers and family researchers as baseline data for judging future policy and program improvements.

ARMY COMMUNITY SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND ARMY FAMILIES:  
A REVIEW OF FINDINGS

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
History of Army Community Support Programs .....	1
Objectives .....	1
Procedures .....	2
GENERAL COMMUNITY SERVICES .....	3
Information Services .....	3
General Support .....	4
Recreation Services .....	6
Relocation Services .....	6
TARGETED COMMUNITY SERVICES .....	7
Army Community Services (General) .....	7
Financial and Emergency Services .....	8
Programs for Spouses .....	9
Children and Youth .....	10
Counseling and Treatment Programs .....	11
Programs for Single Soldiers .....	12
CONCLUSIONS .....	12
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	15
REFERENCES .....	16
APPENDIX A (PRIMARY SOURCES OF RESEARCH INFORMATION) .....	22
APPENDIX B (DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICES) .....	24

# ARMY COMMUNITY SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND ARMY FAMILIES: A REVIEW OF FINDINGS

## INTRODUCTION

### History

A host of demographic changes in the composition of the U. S. Army since the end of World War II have led to substantial changes in the nature of Army community support programs. Among the demographic changes have been a tremendous increase in the percentage of married enlisted personnel, an increase in women in the Army up to 12% of the force in 1992, and concomitant increases in single parents, dual military couples, and employed civilian spouses of Army soldiers (Schumm, Bell, & Tran, 1992b). Along with the increase in married personnel came an increase in military family members, spouses and children, so that by 1955 - for the first time - there were more family members than service members (Bell & Iadeluca, 1987). However, efforts to support families were provided by divergent, often unrelated agencies, including the United Service Organization (USO), the American Red Cross (ARC), the Army Emergency Relief (AER) Agency, chaplains, and military social workers and medical personnel. In 1965 the Army Community Service (ACS) Agency was created to coordinate family programs and services. In 1968 the Army established the Youth Activities (YA) program to "... meet the social, cultural, and recreational needs of youth (Devine, Bullman, & Gaston, 1992, p. 7)." More recently, in 1984, the Army established the Army Community and Family Support Center (CFSC) to centrally administer most of the Army's community and family support programs, including ACS programs, Child Development Services (CDS), and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs (Devine et al., 1992; Vernez & Tharrington, 1988).

### Objectives

Approximately 12 percent of the Army budget is spent on its family and quality of life support programs (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). In an era of downsizing it makes sense to assess the relative effectiveness of Army community support programs, especially the formal programs that require hard dollar funding.<sup>1</sup> The goal of this report is to evaluate the formal community support programs of the U. S. Army primarily in terms of demand (how much the programs are used) and quality from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Community support programs that are not funded by the Army (e.g. Army Emergency Relief, American Red Cross, U. S. Soldiers and Airmen's Home, YMCA/YWCA, Association of the U. S. Army (AUSA), and the United Service Organization (USO)) will not be considered in this report in spite of their obvious and traditional importance to the welfare of service personnel and their families.

customer's perspective (customer satisfaction). In some cases, demand will be considered in terms of relative use of programs by soldiers and families for whom the service is most relevant (i.e., only couples with children might need daycare). Likewise, quality will often be evaluated, when data are available, from the perspective of those most familiar with the particular service, that is, those who have actually used it. Demand and quality will also be analyzed in terms of differences as a function of geographic location (CONUS or OCONUS), housing location (on-post or off-post), military rank, and family member status (soldier versus spouse or other family member). As discussed below, one objective of this report is to provide a comprehensive review of formal Army community support programs. Therefore, a wide range of community support programs will be considered, within the limitations of available information.

### Procedures

Because this report is one of several summary reports on the Army Family Research Program (AFRP), it will rely heavily on data from the 1989 AFRP worldwide research survey of soldiers and spouses, but it will also depend on data from other major regional and worldwide surveys of Army personnel and their families regarding formal community support programs. Each of the major research surveys reviewed for this report is summarized in Appendix A. A detailed analysis of available research on each particular family community support program is provided in Appendix B.

In keeping with the categorization of community programs used in the AFRP project (Bell, 1992a, b)<sup>2</sup> this report will focus on General Community Services and Targeted Services. General Community Services refer to programs that are designed to be used by a wide range of Army personnel and families on a recurring basis. Such general programs include: Information, General Support, Recreation, and Relocation since such services are used by a broad range of Army personnel and families potentially throughout the span of the soldier's career.

Targeted Services are intended to be used by specific subgroups of soldiers and families that have specialized needs or problems, often at only one point in the soldier's career. Under Targeted Services are five general areas including Financial and Emergency Services, Programs for Spouses, Programs for Children and Youth, Counseling and Treatment Programs, and Programs for Single Soldiers.

---

<sup>2</sup> The classification of services into general community services and targeted services was initially developed by Vernez & Zellman (1987).

## General Community Services

### Information Services

Community information services include the directory of community services, the information and referral service, housing location referral service, and post libraries. Overall, program use appears to be low for the directory of community services and information and referral service, moderate for housing location referrals, and high for libraries. Table 1 illustrates usage rates among soldiers and their spouses as reported in AFRP data.

TABLE 1

#### PERCENTAGES OF SOLDIERS/SPOUSES USING VARIOUS INFORMATION SERVICES AS REPORTED IN THE 1989 AFRP SURVEY

<u>Service</u>	<u>Percentage Use</u>		<u>Remarks</u>
	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Spouses</u>	
Directory of Community Services	28	38	Officer use rates nearly twice those of enlisted
Information and Referral Services	28	31	Similar results in 1985 DoD and 1987 ASAF surveys
Housing Location Referrals	45	50	Use was slightly lower in the 1987 RAND survey
Post Libraries	65	65	Similar results in 1984 MWR, 1987 USAREUR, 1987 RAND, and 1987 ASAF surveys

For the most part, AFRP results confirm previous survey results concerning use of information services. Additional findings from the AFRP survey and others are (1) that OCONUS soldiers tend to use information services more often than CONUS based soldiers, as might be expected and (2) that officers are 20 to 100% more likely, depending on the service, to use information services than enlisted. Use of information services also appears to be higher, especially for housing referral services, for off-post residents than for on-post residents. As shown in Table 1, use is slightly higher for most services for spouses as opposed to soldiers.

However, satisfaction appears to be very high for all information services. In the AFRP survey, the percentages of soldiers rating the services as very useful ranged between 69 and 72%, among those who had used the services; comparable ratings by spouses ranged between 78 and 82%. There are at least minor effects of member status, with spouses reporting slightly higher satisfaction than soldiers with most information services. There appear to be moderate to strong effects for use as its influences satisfaction, with users of information services somewhat more satisfied than non-users (very useful ratings ranged between 43 and 65% among non-users). Except for satisfaction with libraries, which was found to be high in several other major surveys, there is little corroborative data on satisfaction with information services reported from the other major surveys.

There does not appear to be any information relating use of or satisfaction with information services to retention or readiness in any of the surveys considered for this report.

In summary, the directory of community services and information and referral service appear to be classifiable as "low use, high satisfaction" community services, which may prove more useful to the Army if they are better publicized and taken advantage of by soldiers and their families. The housing referral service is inbetween, a moderate use, high satisfaction community service. The post library appears to be clearly a "high use, high satisfaction" community service that should clearly receive continued Army support.

### General Support

Unfortunately, relatively little data was collected in the AFRP survey on general community support services such as legal services, transportation on or off-post, family housing, on post banking, chaplains, the post exchange or commissary, medical care, and primary or secondary education. Therefore, most information regarding general community support services comes from other major surveys, especially the 1985 DoD survey, the 1987 ASAF, and the 1987 RAND survey.

In the other major surveys, use of health care services, the post exchange, housing, the commissary, and education was found to be extremely high as might be expected for these are basic services. Use of chaplains and legal services was moderate while use of transportation support was high and use of banking services was very high. The differences in use among these general support programs probably reflect fairly traditional patterns (e.g., soldiers, like other citizens, shop for groceries more often than they need to consult an attorney).

Satisfaction with banking services appeared to be low, with



housing (depending on the type of housing) not much better. Satisfaction with availability of housing and of health services was often moderate, but satisfaction with quality was often low. Notably, satisfaction with housing was especially low among single soldiers in USAREUR but overall there appeared to be problems with quality of construction and safety/security of some housing areas, especially with respect to children's play areas. It is not unlikely that some of the variation in housing satisfaction reflects variations in conditions among different installations. While a majority of soldiers and spouses usually were satisfied with Army health care, in most areas there was a substantial minority (often approximately 20 to 40%) who were dissatisfied. One notable factor tied to dissatisfaction was waiting time to obtain care, probably a reflection of a lack of medical resources, particularly on installations (as opposed to CHAMPUS off-post).

Surprisingly, satisfaction with the post exchange was only moderate (with the lowest ratings from soldiers in OCONUS locations), while high satisfaction ratings were reported for transportation support, the commissary, chaplains, and education. The only general support program to receive a very high satisfaction rating was legal services. However, certain aspects of education (meals, special education, and summer school programs) received very low ratings of satisfaction.

Rank, geographical location, housing location, family member status, and user status had relatively minor and/or infrequent effects on use of and satisfaction with general support programs. Off-post housing was strongly associated with higher satisfaction ratings compared to on-post housing. Officers appeared to be moderately more satisfied with their housing than enlisted, probably an artifact of their higher income. Use of JAG services had a strong effect on satisfaction with those services in the AFRP survey, with soldiers and spouses who had used them rating them as very useful more often (76 - 83%) than non-users (56 - 67%).

Satisfaction with housing, health care, and the commissary appear to be related to retention, but no research was found linking those factors to readiness directly.

None of the general community services could be classified as "low use." While there are probably no general community services uniformly deserving of a classification of "high use, low satisfaction," there are some services that have problem areas either in certain regions (e.g. OCONUS) or certain areas (as in housing and education) that are classified here as "high use, low satisfaction" for purposes of drawing attention to areas of potential improvement. Several general community services appear to merit the classification of "high use, high satisfaction," and should continue to receive Army support (legal



services, chaplains, the commissary).. Transportation services seemed to fall inbetween, moderate in both use and satisfaction.

### Recreation Services

In the AFRP survey, soldiers and spouses were queried only about recreation services in general, so that there are few detailed data on use of or satisfaction with specific recreation programs in that data set. In general, in the AFRP survey, use was high (59 - 67%) as was satisfaction (perceived usefulness, 76 - 80%) for recreation services. However, other major surveys have provided much more detail on various specific recreation services, such as outdoor/indoor sports, recreation centers, bowling, military clubs, arts and crafts, music and theater, and installation special events. In those other surveys, outdoor programs received very high use ratings with recreation centers, indoor sports, bowling, and clubs receiving high use. Installation special events were used at moderate levels. Arts and crafts, along with music and theater, were noted for low use. However, all recreation services received at least high satisfaction ratings on average, with indoor sports receiving the highest satisfaction ratings. Officer use of indoor sports, arts and crafts, and bowling was moderately lower than for enlisted personnel, but otherwise few significant effects of other variables were noted. No effects of recreational services on retention or readiness were reported.

Therefore, overall, recreation services can be classified as a "high use, high satisfaction" community service, that the Army should continue to support.

### Relocation Services

Excellent data are available in the AFRP survey on relocation services. However, in the AFRP survey use of four of the five relocation services (community orientation program, lending closet, premove information, and sponsorship) for both soldiers and spouses ranged between 20 and 34% with relocation counseling showing very low use at only 6 to 8%. Other major surveys, most notably the 1987 ASAF survey, found slightly higher use for community orientation and the lending closet but similarly low use for premove information, relocation counseling, and sponsorship.

However, while satisfaction was moderately high for all the services, even relocation counseling (in the AFRP survey, 44 to 70% of soldiers and spouses rated the five services as very useful), dissatisfaction levels were also higher than usual. In the AFRP survey, relocation counseling and sponsorship received among the highest ratings of all services for lack of usefulness.

The lending closet and sponsorship assistance were used more

often (strong to very strong effects) OCONUS than in CONUS. A very strong effect was observed for officers to use sponsorship and premove information more often than enlisted personnel. Moderate to strong effects were observed for off-post personnel to use the lending closet, premove information, and sponsorship assistance more often than on-post personnel. The largest concern here may be the relatively low use of relocation services by those personnel who probably need them the most - junior enlisted personnel. There was some evidence that officers might be more often satisfied with relocation services than enlisted personnel, probably because of their greater use or receipt of such services. No relationships between relocation service use or satisfaction and retention or readiness were reported in the surveys reviewed.

In general, relocation services appear to be a "low use, (relatively) low satisfaction" community service compared to other general community services. However, because most of the analyses of the major surveys did not control for recency of moves by soldiers and spouses, it is possible that use is underestimated and that satisfaction might be greater among service users than discussed here.

#### Targeted Community Services

##### Army Community Services (ACS - General)

Unfortunately, the AFRP survey did not ask simply and directly about use of and satisfaction with ACS. One question dealt with "programs and services for families at this location" and another concerned the extent to which Army service agencies such as ACS or chaplains could be counted on for help with a personal or family problem. Therefore, the results may reflect use of and satisfaction with services provided by agencies other than ACS. About half of officers (54%) and enlisted (45%) described family services as "good" to "very good." However, married soldiers were less likely to rate such services so positively (only 38%) compared to single soldiers without children (52%). With respect to counting on the Army's services for help, only 40% of soldiers and 23% of spouses responded to a "great" or "very great" extent. In contrast to the results for the first question, with respect to counting on the Army for help married soldiers were more positive (41%) than single soldiers (37%). Part of the lack of satisfaction may reflect apprehension about the impact on one's military career of receiving help - over 20% of spouses agreed that that was a problem. In other major surveys, use of ACS services appeared to increase from 1984 to 1987 but satisfaction levels were higher (52 to 80% satisfied) than in the 1989 AFRP survey. For example, the 1987 USAREUR survey found 72% of soldiers having used ACS within the past year while the 1987 ASAF found a 55% use rate by spouses. Therefore, it seems best to classify ACS services as a "high use, high

satisfaction" program with the caveat that use and satisfaction with certain specific ACS programs might be lower at some installations.

### Financial and Emergency Services

The AFRP survey assessed soldier and spouse use of and satisfaction with financial and emergency services in detail. Table 2 shows the AFRP results. The 1987 ASAF survey also reviewed utility waiver and consumer affairs programs and found minimal use of the programs, especially the latter, but these programs were not considered in the AFRP or other major surveys. In general, it is clear from Table 2 that use of the programs was low (which is not unexpected for targeted programs) but satisfaction was moderate to high, especially for the emergency

TABLE 2  
USE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH FINANCIAL AND EMERGENCY SERVICES  
IN THE 1989 AFRP SURVEY

<u>Service</u>	<u>Percentage Use</u>		<u>Satisfaction(*)</u>	
	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Spouses</u>	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Spouses</u>
Budget Counseling	12	8	47	55
Crisis Hotline	3	3	60	74
Emergency Food	4	5	63	76
Emergency Home Furnishing	7	9	58	70
Emergency Loans	18	21	61	71
Emergency Long Distance Phone Calls	5	4	59	69
Financial Class for Preparing for PCS	6	4	48	55

(\*) Satisfaction measured by percentage of subjects citing service as "very useful" for the Army to offer.

services. Similar results were generally found in other major surveys for these programs. Somewhat surprisingly, there were few geographical or housing area differences in service use. The most notable effect was for rank, with enlisted personnel using the services as much as 500 to 700% more often than officers,

presumably a reflection of the officers' higher pay and allowances. No retention or readiness effects were cited in any studies, although it would be reasonable to expect that soldiers preoccupied with personal, family, or financial emergencies would not perform as well as they might otherwise.

In general, financial and emergency services appear to be "low use, high satisfaction" services which probably warrant continued support. Since they are targeted services, it may not be important to increase use but certainly soldiers and spouses need to be kept aware of the availability of obtaining such help when it is needed.

### Programs for Spouses

Table 3 presents AFRP data on use of and satisfaction with spouse programs. In general, use of such programs is low. Even for spouse employment referrals among spouses looking for work, the use rate was only 36%. Table 3 shows moderate to high ratings of usefulness, but data from other major surveys indicates a great deal of dissatisfaction with spouse employment programs in particular. For example, Bonito's (1986) analysis of 1985 DoD survey data found approximately 40% of soldiers dissatisfied among those who had knowledge of or experience with spouse employment programs, the highest dissatisfaction rating found in his analysis of community services. In an analysis of 1987 RAND survey data, Vernez et al. (1989) found two-thirds of spouses rating the Family Member Employment Assistance Center as only "fair" or "poor," a result that probably is correlated with their reports that the FEMA Center helped only 4% of spouses find a job. It appears most likely that soldiers and spouses have recognized the potential value of spouse employment programs in their responses on the AFRP survey but are citing its inadequacies at present in the other major surveys. In fact, dissatisfaction with spouse employment services may be the greatest single gap in service provision noted in this entire report. Given the apparent relationship of spouse employment to retention, the dissatisfaction warrants substantial attention.

Use of other spouse programs ranged from extremely low to very low, the most frequent use being made of family support groups and TDY/deployment programs and of off-post services. Satisfaction was low for family support groups and moderate for TDY/deployment programs. Even though spouse abuse programs were used infrequently (2%), they received high marks for usefulness in the AFRP survey from soldiers (66% "very useful") and spouses (79% "very useful"). Officers appeared to use family support groups more (very strong effect) as well as off-post services (moderate effect), the latter probably reflecting the greater ease of living off-post if you have a higher income. As might be expected, a very strong effect was noted for off-post personnel

to make more use of off-post services.

TABLE 3  
USE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH SPOUSE PROGRAMS  
IN THE 1989 AFRP SURVEY

<u>Service</u>	<u>Percentage Use</u>		<u>Satisfaction(*)</u>	
	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Spouses</u>	<u>Soldiers</u>	<u>Spouses</u>
Spouse Employment Referrals	19	24	47	54
Spouse Career Planning	6	8	47	54
Spouse Employment Skills Training	6	7	52	65
Programs for Spouses During TDY/Deployments	NA	< 5	58	66
Programs for Foreign Born Wives	NA	< 3	NA	NA
Spouse Abuse Programs	NA	2	66	79
Off-post Outreach Programs	14	NA	NA	NA
Programs for Geographically Separated Spouses	7	NA	NA	NA

(\*) Satisfaction measured by percentage of subjects citing service as "very useful" for the Army to provide.  
NA = data not available (NOTE: Dr. Bell, I think some of this is in the main data book, which I don't have here).

In general, spouse programs could be classified as "low use, high satisfaction" with the exception of the spouse employment programs, which appear to best classified as "low use, low satisfaction."

#### Children and Youth Programs

Use of programs for children and youth is hard to pin down since the target populations for each type of program varies with the age of one's children. Overall, most programs, except youth recreation, child daycare, and services for handicapped family members, were not used as much as might be expected even though some had higher levels of use for certain age groups (e.g. 30% of families with children aged 18 or over used the youth employment service). There appeared to be very low awareness of services for single parent support groups and for foster care programs. While child daycare was seen as very useful by most of the AFRP respondents (67%), it featured the second highest levels of dissatisfaction of any service discussed in this report with only about a third of its users satisfied. Furthermore, satisfaction levels are moderate at best even for the "best" aspects of childcare. No one area of concern seems to be the one problem that if fixed would cure the entire issue. Dissatisfaction with childcare was evident in all the major surveys reviewed, not just the AFRP survey.

Satisfaction levels are also low for the exceptional family member program and parents perceive little support from the Army community for their exceptional family members. Satisfaction levels for youth recreation, youth employment, child care for single parents, child abuse services, and single parent support groups are moderate to high. There is an extremely strong effect for officers to use (or at least report use) child abuse services less often than enlisted, perhaps because of the career stopping fears of using such services. There are minor to moderate effects for spouses to be more satisfied with children and youth programs than for soldiers.

Child care services appear to be related both to retention and readiness. Lakhani & Anderson (1991) found a small relationship between support for officer retention and use of child care. Zellman et al. (1992) found that soldiers lost 3 to 8 days of training time a year because of problems in finding adequate child care. While there was no evidence found on the effect of youth recreation services on retention or readiness, the Army Science Board (1989) concluded that effective programs encouraged the youth to join the Army when they reached eligible enlistment age.

In summary, "high use, low satisfaction" programs appear to include child daycare and services for handicapped family members. Most of the child and youth programs appear to be "low use, high satisfaction" programs, including child abuse services, single parent programs, child care for single parents, and youth employment programs. Youth recreation appears to be a "high use, high satisfaction" program.

#### Counseling and Treatment Programs

Treatment programs, as might be expected, are used very infrequently. In the AFRP survey, use rates for drug and alcohol treatment, individual counseling, and marriage and family therapy ranged from 2 to 12% with half to three quarters of soldiers or spouses rating those services as "very useful." In other major surveys, low use rates were found for rape counseling, parent education programs, marriage enrichment programs, and family life centers. Satisfaction levels are moderate to high with most counseling and treatment services. Soldiers stationed OCONUS appear to be more aware of counseling and treatment programs than those stationed in CONUS, but there are no reports of differences in satisfaction as a function of geographic location. Very few other effects were noted for most services but in the one study that did assess such effects, it was noted that lower rank, lower education, and lower emotional well-being were keyed to greater use of mental health care and counseling (Burnam et al., 1992). No retention or readiness effects were noted.

Most treatment and counseling programs appear to be "low use, high satisfaction" services. Some more preventative programs, such as marriage enrichment and parent education, could probably be expanded from the base of the family life center in order to benefit more Army families and to reduce remedial therapy and its expense in the long run.

#### Programs for Single Soldiers

Relatively little information is available from the AFRP survey on programs for single soldiers. Approximately 14% of single soldiers used social/recreational programs at their installation with fewer (4%) having used premarital counseling services. Approximately half of soldiers and spouses report that each program is "very useful," but separate analyses for single soldiers only have not yet been reported. Having used either service did not appear to be related to its reported usefulness in the AFRP data. Notably there were extremely strong effects in which officers and personnel living off-post were much less likely to use recreational services for singles. Single soldiers involved in serious dating relationships were more likely (5%) to have used premarital counseling than single soldiers who were not in serious relationships (2%). No relationships between these services and retention or readiness were reported.

Accordingly, it appears that both recreational programs and premarital counseling programs can be categorized as "low use, high satisfaction" services that might be expanded by the Army in order to better support single soldiers and their future families.

#### CONCLUSIONS



Overall, as would be expected, use of general community services was much more frequent than was use of targeted community services. General support services and recreation services appeared to be used more often than information services or relocation services. While many soldiers and their families have had an occasion to use an ACS program (high use), the use rate for any specific program tends to be extremely to very low. Services that may be underused include the information and referral service, the directory of community services, spouse employment services, financial and emergency services, child abuse programs, youth employment programs, arts and crafts, music and theater, relocation counseling, foster care programs, singles recreation services, single parent programs, and treatment and counseling programs, including marriage enrichment programs (if not premarital counseling). Those that have received high satisfaction ratings may need more publicity (directory, information and referral, arts and crafts, music and theater, marriage enrichment/premarital counseling, child abuse services, youth employment, treatment and counseling programs, singles' recreational programs, and single parent programs) while the others (relocation services and spouse employment services) may require reevaluation as to their long term value unless changes in awareness and/or quality are made. Sponsorship for junior enlisted personnel within the relocation services remains a concern because they probably need it most and tend to receive it the least.

High use services included housing, education, child daycare, services for handicapped family members, post libraries, housing referral office, legal services, chaplains, commissaries, recreational services, ACS services in general, and youth recreation programs. The greatest dissatisfaction was found with spouse employment services, childcare services, banking services, family support groups, housing, and services for handicapped family members, although other areas had pockets of dissatisfaction (education, health care, post exchange). A common theme to most of the areas of dissatisfaction is time, time wasted waiting for housing, doctor's appointments, getting a job, waiting in line at the bank, or finding childcare at times that fit one's work schedule, etc. High satisfaction was associated with high use for post libraries, housing referral offices, legal services, chaplains, commissaries, recreational services, ACS services in general, and youth recreational programs.

Specific areas keyed to retention include the commissary, housing, health care, and spouse employment. However, it was possible that the summative effects of specific programs might have an effect on retention and/or readiness even if individual programs did not.



Devine et al. (1992) did not report relationships between specific community support services and readiness/retention factors but they did report more generalized results.

After categorizing programs into general services and targeted services, Devine et al. (1992) report that 43% of soldiers had used targeted services compared to 55% of spouses, while 68% of soldiers had used general services compared to 73% of spouses. Clearly, their analysis indicates that spouses were more frequent users of community support services than soldiers.

Devine et al. (1992) looked at relationships between soldiers' use of general<sup>3</sup> programs and perceived leader support for families, soldier performance as rated by supervisor, family adaptation, and re-enlistment plans. In terms of perceived leader support for families, those who rated leader support as high were more likely to have used general services (48.6% versus 38.5%<sup>4</sup>) while those who rate it as medium (50% versus 57%) or low (2% versus 4%) were less likely to have used general services. Supervisor-rated job performance was related to general program use with better soldiers using the programs more and average or below average soldiers using them less, as follows: rated as "one of the best" (18% versus 12%), "above average" (33% versus 29%), "average" (40% versus 47%), "below average" (8% versus 10%), and "one of the worst" (1% versus 3%). Soldiers with high or moderate family adaptation were more likely to have used general programs: high adaptation (38% versus 34%), moderate adaptation (33% versus 31%), low adaptation (29% versus 35%). Retention/re-enlistment plans were also related to general program use: high probability of re-enlisting (36% versus 28%), likely probability (18% versus 16%), not likely (23% versus 22%), and no chance (23% versus 34%).

The only data presented on use of targeted program services by Devine et al. (1992) pertains to retention, which was positively associated with targeted program use: high probability of re-enlisting (39% versus 29%), likely probability (18% versus 17%), not likely (24% versus 22%), and no chance (20% versus 32%).

However, Griffith, Rakoff, & Helms (1992) did use AFRP data to study general satisfaction with community life and projected

---

<sup>3</sup> Data for use of specific programs was not reported.

<sup>4</sup> In Table 7 on page 51, Devine et al. (1992) report 35.5% but on page 51 in discussing the analysis they report 39%; since the figures only add up to 100% if the actual value is 38.5% (rounded up to 39%), we assume the number in Table 7 is a typographical error.

reenlistment. They combined five items about community life (quality of place for children to grow up, quality of medical care for family members, programs and services for families, quality of community you live in, and opportunity to make good friends) and evaluated that scale against retention intentions. The lower the rank of the soldier, the more important community satisfaction was for retention. For example, only 19% of junior enlisted said there was no chance they would stay if they were high on community satisfaction, compared to 36% for those low on community satisfaction; conversely, 33% of those high on community satisfaction report a high probability of reenlisting compared to 16% of those low on community satisfaction. It is likely that formal and informal community support systems compensate in part for the reduced resources that junior enlisted receive by way of their lower status and income.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, Army community support programs and services are being used and are being evaluated favorably by the majority of their users. However, some recommendations are in order.

- \* More publicity be given to proven services that seem to underutilized, including the directory of community services, information and referral service, arts and crafts, music and theater, youth employment, child abuse services, treatment and counseling programs, financial and emergency services, single parent programs, and marriage enrichment/premarital counseling.
- \* A second look be taken at several low use, low satisfaction services that may need to be adjusted to better meet soldier and family needs, including relocation counseling, especially sponsorship for junior enlisted, and spouse employment programs.
- \* Continued efforts be maintained to improve the availability and quality of housing, child care, education, banking, the post exchange, and family support groups, areas that feature high levels of dissatisfaction and high use. One common theme might be how to save soldiers and family members time through improvements in these services.
- \* Additional follow-up analyses should be made with AFRP data to quantify the cost effectiveness of making improvements in community support programs with respect to the relationships found between such programs and retention and readiness.

#### REFERENCES

- Bell, D. B. (1992a). "Army Family Research Program." Briefing presented to BG R. T. Roe, CG, USACFSC, 11 February.
- Bell, D. B. (1992b). "The Army Family Research Program: Research on community/quality of life." Briefing presented to MAJ Kickbush, Directorate of Human Resources, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, 14 August.
- Bell, D. B., & Iadeluca, R. B. (1987). The origins of volunteer support for Army Family Programs. (Research Report 1456). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bonito, A. J. (1986). Report to Congress: A discussion of military dependents' issues based on the 1985 DOD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. Research Triangle Park, NC.: Research Triangle Institute.
- Bowen, G. L. (1984). Evaluation of the U. S. Air Force Family Support Center program. Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 303-310.
- Bowen, G. L. (1989). Satisfaction with family life in the military. Armed Forces and Society, 15, 571-592.
- Bowen, G. L., Orthner, D. K., Zimmerman, L. I., & Meehan, T. (1992). Family patterns and adaptation in the U. S. Army. (Technical Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bowen, G. L., & Neenan, P. A. (1990). The relationship between the perceived level of organizational support for families and spouse satisfaction with military life. (Technical Report 874). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Burnam, M. A., Meredith, L. S., Sherbourne, C. D., Valdez, R. B., & Vernez, G. (1992). Army families and soldier readiness. (Report R-3884-A). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation (Arroyo Center).
- Coolbaugh, K., Perrine, H. S., & Griffith, J. D. (1990). Spouse employment user summary. (Research Note 90-98).

Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Croan, G. M., LeVine, C. T., & Blankinship, D. A. (1991). Family adjustment to relocation. (Technical Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Devine, P., Bullman, S., & Gaston, M. (1992). Army community support programs: needs and access among Army families. (Technical Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Glacel, B. P., Brogan, W. M., Chapman, L. F., Jr., Daniels, L. S., Edens, B. D., Fredrickson, R. M., Henriksen, T. H., Laidlaw, F. J., & McLeod, J. S. (1989). The Army Community and their families. Washington, D. C.: The Army Science Board.

Griffith, J., Rakoff, S. H., & Helms, R. F. (1992). Family and other impacts on retention. (Technical Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Griffith, J. D., Stewart, L. S., & Cato, E. D. (1988). Annual Survey of Army Families: A report on Army spouses and families in 1987. Summary Report. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Griffith, J. D., Stewart, L. S., & Cato, E. D. (1988). Annual Survey of Army Families: A report on Army spouses and families in 1987. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Kralj, M. M., Sadacca, R., Stawarski, C., & Kimmel, M. (1991). USAREUR Personnel Opinion Survey 1986: A report on family issues. (Research Note 91-23). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Lakhani, H. A., & Ardison, S. (1991). The determinants of child care use and retention in the U. S. Army. (Technical Report 945). Alexandria, VA: The U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

LaVange, L. M., McCalla, M. E., Gabel, T. J., Rakoff, S. H., Doering, Z. D., & Mahoney, B. S. (1986). Description of

officers and enlisted personnel in the U. S. Armed Forces: 1985. Supplementary Tabulations from the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. (Volume III). Arlington, VA.: Defense Manpower Data Center. (AD-A177 682).

Martin, J. A. (1992). Research issues: 1992 DoD Family Conference. Paper presented at the DoD Family Conference, Orlando, Florida, November 5.

Martin, J. A., & Orthner, D. K. (1989). The "Company Town" in transition: Rebuilding military communities. Chapter 8, pp. 163-177, in G. L. Bowen & D. K. Orthner (Eds.), The organization family: work and family linkages in the U. S. military. Westport, CT: Praeger.

McCalla, M. E., Rakoff, S. H., Doering, Z. D., & Mahoney, B. S. (1986). Description of officers and enlisted personnel in the U. S. Armed Forces: 1985. A report based on the 1985 DoD Survey of Officer and Enlisted Personnel. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. (AD-A177 682).

Office of the Army Recreation Center Program Manager (Community Recreation Directorate). (1991). Army Recreation Centers: The customers speak. Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center.

Orthner, D. K. (1986). Research, policy, and programs needs for Army communities. (Unpublished manuscript). Athens, GA: Center for Work and Family Issues, University of Georgia.

Orthner, D. K. (1990). Family impacts on the retention of military personnel. Pp. 82-98 in D. A. Blankinship, S. L. Bullman, & G. M. Croan (Eds.), The policy, program, and fiscal implications of military family research: proceedings of the 1990 military family research review. Fairfax, VA: Caliber Associates.

Orthner, D. K., Bowen, G., Zimmerman, L. I., & Short, K. A. (1992). Young single soldiers and relationships. (Technical Report) Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Orthner, D. K., Duvall, E., & Stawarski, C. (1990). Community satisfaction: implications for Army communities. (Research Note 90-96). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Orthner, D. K., Early-Adams, P., & Pollock, D. (1988).

Community support programs: Review of the literature.  
(Final draft). Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Orthner, D. K., Pollock, D. L., Early-Adams, P., Duvall, E., Giddings, M., & Morley, R. (1988). Building strong Army communities. (Final draft). Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Ozkaptan, H., Sanders, W., & Holz, R. (1986). A profile of Army families in USAREUR: Results of the 1983 families in Europe survey. (Research Report 1428). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI Scientific Coordination Office in USAREUR).

Research Triangle Institute and Caliber Associates. (1990). Summary of findings from the Community and Family Support Image Awareness Survey. (Final Report, submitted to the U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center). Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Scarville, J. (1990). Spouse employment in the Army: Research findings. (Research Report 1555). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Schneider, R. J., & Gilley, M. A. (1984). Family adjustment in USAREUR: Final report. (Unpublished manuscript). APO, NY 09102: U. S. Army Medical Research Unit-Europe (HQ, 7th MEDCOM).

Schumm, W. R., Bell, D. B., & Tran, G. (1992a). Family adaptation to the demands of Army life: a review of findings. (Research Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Schumm, W. R., Bell, D. B., & Tran, G. (1992b). The demography of Army families: a review of findings. (Research Report). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Soriano, F. I. (1988). Navy Family Service Centers: An Analysis of command benefits. Paper presented at the 96th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA, August 14.

U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center (Leisure Sales

- and Services Division) (1985). Morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) world-wide survey analysis. Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center.
- U. S. Army Europe (1988). USAREUR personnel opinion survey general findings report 1987. (USAREUR Pamphlet 600-2). APO New York 09403: HQ, U. S. Army Europe.
- U. S. Army Europe (1992). USAREUR personnel opinion survey 1991 general findings report. (Volume I, Family). APO New York 09403: HQ, U. S. Army Europe.
- Vernez, G., Burnam, A., Sherbourne, C. D., & Meredith, L. (1989). Army family programs and readiness study: Descriptive tabulations of the 1987 Surveys of Soldiers and Spouses. (Working Draft). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Vernez, G., & Zellman, G. L. (1987). Families and mission: A review of the effects of family factors on Army attrition, retention, and readiness. (RAND Note N-2624-A). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Vernez, G., & Tharrington, M. F. (1988). Army quality-of-life programs: Expenditures and users. (Working Draft). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Wood, L. (1990). Family economics and the retention intentions of Army enlisted personnel. (Research Note 90-68). Alexandria, VA: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Zellman, G. L., Johansen, A. S., & Meredith, L. S. (1992). Improving the delivery of military child care: An analysis of current operations and new approaches. (Research Report R-4145-FMP) Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.



## APPENDIX A

### SOURCES OF DATA ON ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICES

Vernez & Tharrington (1988) in a draft RAND report provided data on community services from four sources: the 1984 MWR survey, the 1985 and 1986 Army Sample Surveys of Military Personnel (SSMP), and the 1985 DoD Survey; they also include data (not repeated in this report) on funding amounts and sources for community programs in the Army. Furthermore, the 1985 DoD Survey has been analyzed in terms of Army community services by several authors, including Bowen (1989), Bonito (1986), and Doering & Mahoney (1987). Further detail on the 1984 MWR survey that surveyed over 32,000 soldiers on 13 MWR programs is available in a report from the U. S. Army Community and Family Support Center (1985).

Kralj, Sadacca, Stawarski, & Kimmel (1991) have reported results from the 1986 USAREUR Personnel Opinion Survey, which had some items on community services. Their report featured results from two random surveys of 5,823 and 3,274 military personnel, a sample of 642 DA civilians, and a sample of 1,403 adult family members.

HQ, USAREUR (1988) summarized results from the 1987 USAREUR personnel opinion survey which involved responses from 5,113 soldiers (33% return rate) and 1,899 spouses (34% return rate). The returned surveys were predominately from junior enlisted personnel (54%) with smaller percentages from mid-level NCOs (30%), senior NCOs (8%), junior and warrant officers (8%), and field grade officers (2%). Most of the respondents were males (89%), married to a civilian (46%) or another soldier (6%), and white (66%) or black (22%) or Hispanic (8%).

Vernez, Burnam, Sherbourne, & Meredith (1989) in a draft RAND report discuss results from the 1987 RAND Surveys of Soldiers and Spouses that pertain to community support. An official summary report of the same 1987 survey was authored by Burnam et al. (1992) but it lacked as much information on community services as had been reported in the 1989 draft report. Nevertheless, Burnam et al. (1992, p. 52) describe the 1987 RAND survey as "... the first study that comprehensively has collected data on how soldiers (and their spouses) use a broad array of Army-sponsored services."

Griffith, Stewart, & Cato (1988) summarized results from the 1987 Annual Survey of Army Families (ASAF), the first worldwide survey of Army spouses. The 1987 ASAF was sent in early June 1987 (with a follow-up in late July 1987) to the civilian spouses of 8,141 officers and 12,131 enlisted personnel (about 10% and 3%, respectively, of all such wives of officers and enlisted personnel as located in the Officer and Enlisted

Master Files). Approximately 70% of the officer wives and 54% of the enlisted wives responded, finally yielding a total of 11,854 usable responses.

In late 1989 RTI (1990) conducted a telephone survey of 322 soldiers and 293 spouses from 49 CONUS units in order to assess the image of various ACS and CFSC programs. The response rates for soldiers and spouses were 70% and 76%, respectively.

The 1989 Army Family Research Program (AFRP) survey involved a random sample of over 11,000 soldiers and nearly 3,300 spouses from across the world and obtained data on the use and usefulness of 39 Army community support programs (Devine, Bullman, & Gaston, 1992).

USAREUR Pamphlet 600-2, USAREUR Personnel Opinion Survey 1991: General Findings Report, Volume 1 (Family) (USAREUR, 1991) reports results from a survey of 4,177 spouses of soldiers representing 2,601 families of soldiers deployed to DESERT STORM. Most of the spouses were females (89%), white (77%; 13% were black, 5% Hispanic), and married to an enlisted soldier (16%, E1 to E4; 39%, E5 to E6; 17%, E7 to E9; 6%, warrant officer; 12%, LT to CPT; and 11% MAJ or above).

## APPENDIX B

### DETAILED ANALYSIS OF ARMY COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES

There are at least 65 different formal Army community support programs (Burnam, Meredith, Sherbourne, Valdez, & Vernez, 1992; Vernez & Tharrington, 1988), although the AFRP focused on 39 such programs (Bell, 1992a, b). Some Army community support programs have never been evaluated in the major research surveys reviewed for this report; among these, the following 17 programs will not be discussed further because of this lack of information:

#### MWR Activities

- Restaurant & Resale
- Golf
- Civilian Employee Program

#### Non-MWR Activities

- Laundry and Drycleaning
- Postal Service
- Radio & Television (OCONUS)
- Chaplains
  - Religious Education Programs
  - Religious Workshops
  - Chapel Facilities

#### Education

- Overseas Student Meal Program
- Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support Services
- Education Center Test Center
- Foreign Language Training
- Post Secondary Education
- Service Members Opportunity College Associate Degree Program

#### Relocation

- Transient Unaccompanied Personnel Housing
- Homeowners Assistance (DOD)

General Community Services will be reviewed in the following

sequence:

Information Resources

- Directory of community services (ACS)
- Information and referral service (ACS)
- Housing location referrals
- Libraries (MWR)

General Support

- Legal services (JAG)
- Transportation support
- Housing
- Banking
- Chaplains
- Commissary
- Post Exchange
- Health care services
- Education

Recreation Services

- Recreation centers
- Indoor sports
- Bowling
- Arts and crafts
- Music and theater
- Outdoor programs
- Installation special events
- Military clubs

Relocation Services

- Community orientation
- Lending closet
- Premove information
- Relocation counseling
- Sponsorship assistance

The sequence in which targeted services will be presented is:

Financial and Emergency Services (ACS)

- Army Community Services (General)
- Budget counseling
- Crisis hotline
- Emergency food
- Emergency home furnishings
- Emergency loans
- Emergency long distance phone

Utility waiver program  
Consumer affairs programs  
Financial classes for PCS moves

#### Programs for Spouses (ACS)

Employment programs  
Special needs  
    Programs during TDY/deployment (including Family support groups)  
    Services for foreign-born spouses  
    Spouse abuse services  
    Services for off-post families  
    Services for geographically separated families

#### Children and Youth

Child daycare (CDS)  
Child abuse services (ACS)  
Services for handicapped family members (ACS)  
    (Exceptional Family Member Program)  
Single parent support groups (ACS)  
Special child care for single parents (CDS)  
Youth employment (ACS)  
Youth recreation (MWR)  
Foster care programs (ACS)  
Latchkey programs (ACS)

#### Counseling and Treatment Programs

Drug and alcohol treatment (MEDICAL)  
Individual counseling  
Marriage and family therapy  
Marriage enrichment  
Family life centers (CHAPLAINS)  
Parent education  
Rape counseling

#### Programs for Single Soldiers

Social/recreational programs (MWR)  
Premarital counseling

For each area, research will be presented chronologically in accordance with the year in which the survey data were collected from Army soldiers and their families. When possible, differences in use or satisfaction as a function of rank, geographical location, housing location, and source (soldier or spouse) will be discussed.

To facilitate comparison across areas without generating confusion over minor differences in results the following general

categories will be used when reporting the results for each area:

#### Program Use

90 - 100%	Extremely High
75 - 89%	Very High
55 - 74%	High
40 - 54%	Moderate
20 - 39%	Low
10 - 19%	Very Low
0 - 9%	Extremely Low

It must be recognized that infrequent use does not necessarily imply that the service is unimportant to those who do use it.

#### Program Satisfaction

75 - 100%	Very High
60 - 74%	High
45 - 59%	Moderate
0 - 44%	Low

The range of satisfaction categories is less than for program use because very few programs were rated as satisfactory by more than 80% or less than 40% of soldiers or spouses.

#### Other Effects

100+ % change	Extremely strong
50 - 99% change	Very strong
31 - 49% change	Strong
16 - 30% change	Moderate
10 - 15% change	Minor

For example, if 50% of those living off-post use a service compared to 40% of those living on-post ( $50/40 = 1.25$ , 25% effect) this would be considered a moderate effect (or correlate) of housing location.

#### Methodological Limitations

It is not certain that soldiers and families respond to Army community support programs in the same way during peacetime as they do during a major mobilization; therefore, data from use of and satisfaction with community support programs during DESERT STORM is not included in this report because those results, which are still being assessed and are therefore not yet complete, may not generalize to the more common peacetime situation.

One limitation common to all the surveys reviewed is that they do not take into account the fact that some installations do not provide all possible community support services. Therefore,

some soldiers will report that they have not used a service because they did not have it available at their location; the consequence is that service use may be underestimated in proportion to the extent the service or program is popular at various installations.

Another limitation to keep in mind with respect to usage questions in surveys is that the timeframe may differ from one survey to another. For example, the 1987 RAND survey (Burnam et al., 1992) asked soldiers if they had used particular services within the past six months; in contrast, the 1989 AFRP survey asked soldiers and spouses if they had ever used particular services at their current location. Since most soldiers are stationed at one location for a year or more, one would expect to see apparently higher use rates for the same service in the AFRP survey compared to the RAND survey (although the opposite result would occur if a majority of soldiers surveyed had just moved to their current location, not having had a chance to use many of the services). Questions about some services, such as relocation services or the lending closet, may be sensitive in that they may tend to be used at the very beginning or the very end of a soldier's tour at one location. The RAND survey would tend to underestimate use of such services because many soldiers who had used them might not have done so within the past six months because they were in the middle of their tour. The AFRP survey by contrast would tend to capture services used at the beginning of a tour accurately but underestimate services used near the end of a tour (soldiers who just used the service at their old location wouldn't be counted as users).

Satisfaction questions can vary as well. In the AFRP survey, soldiers and spouses were not asked how satisfied they were with programs but how useful they felt it was for the Army to offer such programs. It would be possible for soldiers to believe that programs were at least potentially useful even if they were presently very unsatisfactory or to think that if cost was no object just about any program might be useful to someone in the Army and therefore be useful to offer.

Another methodological issue to remember concerns relative use of services by enlisted versus officer personnel. Because there are many more enlisted personnel than officers, total use figures will approximate enlisted use more than officer use. Furthermore, even if a higher percentage of officers use a service than enlisted, the total number of enlisted users may be greater than officer users. For example, 70% of officers and 60% of enlisted might use a particular service, but 80% of all users might be enlisted.

Other methodological concerns that could potentially affect

the interpretation of survey results will be raised as appropriate throughout the discussion of the various program areas.

## General Community Services

### Information Resources

#### Directory of community services.(ACS)

The AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) found 28% of soldiers and 38% of spouses reporting they had used the directory at their current location. Use varied with rank, installation location, and housing location. Officers used directories more than enlisted (48% versus 25%). Use was greater in Europe (32%) and other OCONUS sites (30%) than in CONUS (26%). Off-post soldiers used it more (31%) than soldiers living on-post (27%). Most soldiers (51%) and spouses (65%) found the directory to be very useful. However, those soldiers and spouses who had used the directory described it as very useful (70%/82%) more often than those who hadn't used it (43%/54%).

#### Information and referral services.(ACS)

This service provides information on military and community resources available to assist soldiers and their families (Devine et al., 1992).

Bonito (1986) presented data on the availability of and dissatisfaction with crisis referral services from the 1985 DoD Survey. Substantial numbers of personnel at that time were not aware of crisis referral service availability at or near their installation: 52%, enlisted CONUS; 46%, OCONUS; 53%, officer CONUS; 45%, officer OCONUS. Of those aware of the service, most recognized it as existing on post: 85%, enlisted CONUS; 89%, enlisted OCONUS; 83%, officer CONUS; 84%, officer, OCONUS. There was relatively little dissatisfaction with crisis referral services among all personnel: 10%, enlisted CONUS; 11%, enlisted OCONUS; 7%, officer CONUS; 14%, officer OCONUS.

Spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45) indicated low use (34%) of information and referral services, though higher (46%) among those aware of the service. Even 62% of spouses of soldiers of rank E4 or below were aware of the service. Use was slightly higher OCONUS (38%) than in CONUS (32%).

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) the service had been used by 28% of soldiers and 31% of spouses, with officers more likely to use it than enlisted (37% versus 26%) and soldiers living off-post (31%) more likely to use it than those living on-post (25%). Use was slightly more frequent in Europe (32%)



than in CONUS (26%) or other OCONUS (27%) locations. In terms of usefulness, 53% of soldiers and 64% of spouses rated the service as very useful<sup>5</sup>; those who had used it rated it very useful more often (69%/80%) than those soldiers/spouses who had not used it (47%/58%).

#### Housing location referrals. (Housing Referral Office)

Vernez et al. (1989) report from 1987 RAND survey data that 14% of all soldiers found housing after their last PCS move through the Army Housing Referral Service. Senior enlisted (18%) and soldiers assigned to Germany (24%) were the most likely to use the referral service successfully, as well as single or married enlisted with children (22%). The Army assigned housing to 42% of soldiers, while 19% of soldiers found housing on their own (the remainder found it through friends, relatives, newspaper ads, or private housing locators).

The AFRP survey (Croan, LeVine, & Blankinship, 1991; Devine et al., 1992) found that 42-47% of soldiers and 47-53% of spouses had used housing location referrals at their current location.<sup>6</sup> Use varied by rank, officers (60%), enlisted (39%). Use was greater in Europe (49%) than in CONUS (39%) or other OCONUS sites (34%). Soldiers living off-post (55%) were more likely to have used the service than soldiers living on-post (30%). While the service had relatively high ratings as very useful by soldiers (59-61%) and spouses (71-73%). Soldiers and spouses who had used the service were more likely to rate it as very useful (72%/78%) than those who hadn't used it (51%/65%).

#### Libraries. (MWR)

The 1984 MWR survey found about a third of officers and enlisted personnel using libraries more than twice a month with another 30-40% of all personnel using them at least a few times a year (Vernez & Thaarrington, 1988). Libraries proved to be used more OCONUS than in CONUS in the 1984 MWR survey. Satisfaction levels were very high for military libraries - 88% satisfied with only 4% dissatisfied. One of the more notable "family" areas of dissatisfaction with libraries was an 8% dissatisfaction rating for variety of books for children (in addition 30% of respondents answered "do not know" about this issue, the highest such percentage for any issue presented in the survey).

---

<sup>5</sup> Useful as a service for the Army to provide, rather than as personally useful.

<sup>6</sup> Croan et al. (1991) and Devine et al. (1992) give slightly different estimates of service use, which accounts for the spread in percentage use cited.

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey nearly half (49%) of the soldiers responding said they had used the post library within the past month and most of the rest (44%) had used it one to six times within the past year. Satisfaction was high (70%) with few reporting dissatisfaction (5%).

Burnam et al. (1992), using 1987 RAND survey data, report that 54% of soldiers used a base library within the past six months (those who went to the library used it an average of nine times in the six months). Greater use of the library was found to be associated with higher education, enlisted rank, location outside CONUS (especially Korea), location at a rural base, having had more PCS moves, and working fewer hours per week.

Library use was high (70%) among spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45), with 85% of users satisfied with the service. Use was higher among spouses of officers and OCONUS than in CONUS.

Devine et al. (1992) reported from the AFRP survey that 65% of both soldiers and spouses had used post libraries at their current location with use higher among officers (74%) than enlisted (63%). Usage was virtually identical for off-post and on-post soldiers (65%). Use was more frequent in Europe (72%) than in CONUS (61%) or other OCONUS (68%) locations. Most soldiers (62%) and spouses (72%) rated libraries as "very useful." While Devine et al. (1992) omit data on users/non-users for soldiers, they report that 82% of spouses who had used libraries rated them as "very useful" compared to 52% of those who hadn't used them.

The most popular MWR activity in the 1991 USAREUR family survey was the community library, used by 65 to 72% of families. Use appeared to increase for both deployed and nondeployed families while satisfaction remained high (75 - 79%) with few dissatisfied (7 - 8%).

#### General Support

#### Legal services. (Judge Advocate General)

Data from the 1985 DoD Survey (Bonito, 1986) indicate that married soldiers were seldom unaware of the availability of legal assistance: 8%, enlisted CONUS; 5%, enlisted OCONUS; 7%, officer CONUS; 2%, officer OCONUS. Approximately 96% of all personnel who indicated awareness of legal assistance indicated that it was available on-post. Only 8% - 11% of all personnel who had knowledge of or had used legal assistance reported dissatisfaction with it.

Legal services in the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) had been used by 53% of soldiers and 51% of spouses. Use was greater

for officers (66%) than for enlisted (50%) and for soldiers living off-post (60%) than on-post (47%). Use was slightly greater in Europe (55%) than in CONUS (52%) or other OCONUS (48%) locations. Legal services received relatively high ratings as "very useful" by soldiers (65%) and spouses (74%), more so by soldiers/spouses who had used them (76%/83) than by those who hadn't (56%/67%).

The 1991 USAREUR family survey found most spouses citing the legal assistance office as supportive both before (55 - 57%) and since (60 - 61%) DESERT STORM.

#### Transportation Support

Kralj et al. (1991) in the 1986 USAREUR survey found that relatively few soldiers were dissatisfied with their Community Transportation Office's quality of service for shipping personal property (15% to 22% dissatisfied); even fewer were unhappy with service for obtaining transportation for self or family members (10% to 17% dissatisfied).

Bus service was cited by 7% of divorced/separated soldiers in the 1986 USAREUR survey as the service most needing improvement (Kralj et al., 1991).

The 1987 ASAF survey asked spouses about their need for on or off-post mass transportation and its availability at their installation (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 38-39). Overall, need for on-post or off-post transportation was cited by 23% and 28% of spouses respectively; however, needs were greater for enlisted spouses (25%/29%) than for spouses of officers (15%/20%) and for spouses located OCONUS (33%/46%) than in CONUS (16%/15%). Availability of transportation off-post (61%) or on-post (62%) is not uncommon. However, some spouses who need transportation report that it is not available - 22% for on-post and 26% for off-post.

#### Family housing

Housing was the service/facility cited as needing the most improvement by 20-21% of married soldiers in the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj et al, 1991), generally second to medical care, but was cited by divorced/separated soldiers as well as a problem (third after medical care and banking, 12%) and by never married soldiers (fifth after banking, medical care, PX, clubs, at 7%).

In the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj et al., 1991) housing was cited as the most important factor influencing the decision to extend the current European tour by 19% of soldiers married to civilians, making it the second most important factor behind present duty assignment, cited by 29% of soldiers as most important. However, between 10% and 14% of soldiers from other

family types cited housing as the most important factor influencing the decision to extend their tour, placing it either third or fourth compared to other factors. In the second USAREUR survey of that year, satisfaction with the housing office during inprocessing varied considerably by family type; never married soldiers were mostly neutral (70%) with very few unhappy (10%), but currently or formerly married soldiers tended to disagree that the office was helpful (20% to 35% disagreed). Quality of housing also varied by family type with 43% of never married soldiers rating it poor to very poor compared to 15% of dual military family soldiers, 23% of soldiers married to civilians, or 34% of divorced/separated soldiers.

The 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey found that spouses were at least somewhat satisfied with the availability of quality housing (53% satisfied) although 11% rated the quality of their housing as poor or very poor, with another 30% rating it as only "adequate."

Sterling & Allen (1983) found adequacy of Army family and troop housing to be a moderately strong predictor of retention intentions among enlisted personnel, but not officers. Allen & Bell (1980) found that perceived safety in one's quarters correlated significantly with level of satisfaction with the Army, a standard correlate of retention intentions.

Doering & Mahoney (1987) reporting on data from the 1985 DoD survey found relatively few soldiers satisfied with the availability of military housing. Percentages of various personnel describing availability of military housing as good or excellent were as follows: enlisted unmarried, no children (11%); enlisted married to civilian spouse, no children (15%), enlisted married to civilian spouse, with children (22%), officer unmarried with no children (14%), officer married to civilian spouse with no children (23%) and officer married to civilian spouse with children (24%). Parallel figures for the ratings of availability of civilian housing were 23%, 38%, 33%, 54%, 54%, and 50%, much higher than for military housing. Overall, 16% of enlisted and 25% of officers were satisfied with availability of military housing with 26% of enlisted and 48% of officers satisfied with availability of civilian housing; in terms of quality of military housing, only 20% of enlisted and 26% of officers were satisfied (McCalla, Rakoff, Doering, & Mahoney, 1986).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 36-40) have provided results from Army spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey with respect to housing. Highest satisfaction rates were found for housing owned off-post by officers (94% satisfied) or enlisted personnel (91% satisfied). Lower rates of satisfaction were found for off-post rented housing for officers (75%) and enlisted (52%). Government

housing was rated in the middle generally whether on-post for officers (70%) or enlisted (63%) or off-post for officers (72%) or enlisted (58%). The 1987 ASAF also collected data on several specific aspects of housing satisfaction; Griffith et al. (1988) reported the results of those specific areas for government housing:

<u>Aspect</u>	<u>Percent Satisfied</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Location of housing area	82%	Higher satisfaction for on-post (85%) than for off-post (67%).
Trash collection	78%	Satisfaction higher in CONUS (86%) than in OCONUS (73%); higher for on-post (80%) than for off-post (69%).
Safety of play areas for children	47%	Officers' spouses more satisfied (75%) than enlisted (45%)
Quality of building construction	49%	
Security of housing area	51%	Officers' spouses more satisfied (62%) than enlisted (48%); satisfaction higher in CONUS (60%) than OCONUS (44%); higher for on-post (53%) than for off-post (38%).
Storage space	52%	Officers' spouses less satisfied than enlisted
Maintenance of common areas	52%	
Maintenance of the building	53%	

Maintenance of  
appliances and  
equipment

65%

Safety of the  
building and  
equipment

62%

Size of quarters

58%

Officers' spouses less  
satisfied than  
enlisted

#### On-post banking services

Kralj et al. (1991) have reported that on-post banking was the service most in need of improvement according to 28% of never married soldiers in USAREUR and was rated second by divorced/separated soldiers, third by married soldiers.

Satisfaction was relatively low in the 1987 USAREUR survey (USAREUR, 1988) with banking services: 30% satisfied, 23% neutral, and 47% dissatisfied. Respondents said that they often had to wait in line more than 20 minutes (41%) on average. Most respondents used the local military bank at least weekly (45%) or monthly (34%). By comparison, spouses reported more satisfaction (40% satisfied) and less dissatisfaction (35% dissatisfied) than did soldiers. About the same percent (37%) said they had to wait in line more than 20 minutes on average. The percentages of spouses using the local military bank at least weekly (48%) or monthly (33%) were very similar to those for soldiers.

#### Chaplains

Bonito (1986) provided data from the 1985 DoD survey on the availability, use, and satisfaction for chaplain services as evaluated by married officers and enlisted personnel accompanied by command-sponsored dependents (not including single parents, unmarried soldiers, or married soldiers separated from spouse and children on an unaccompanied tour). Few enlisted and officer personnel were not aware of the availability of chaplain services at their installation (8%, enlisted CONUS; 5%, enlisted OCONUS; 8%, officer CONUS; 2%, officer OCONUS). Furthermore, of those who knew of the service, 95%-97% reported it as available on base. Approximately 3% - 6% of all personnel, CONUS or OCONUS, were dissatisfied with chaplain services.

"Chapel" was cited by 11% of military family members surveyed in the 1986 USAREUR survey as the facility providing the best family support (Kralj et al., 1991).

Griffith et al. (1988, p. 46) in the 1987 ASAF survey found

that the chaplain ministry was used by 46% of spouses, of whom 75% were satisfied. Use was a bit higher for spouses of officers but satisfaction was a bit lower OCONUS.

The 1991 USAREUR family survey found spouses of both deployed and nondeployed soldiers relatively aware of (87 - 88%) chaplains and most (43 - 45%) finding them supportive compared to only 3 - 4% non-supportive.

#### Commissary service

Vernez & Zellman (1987) report that the 1979 DoD Survey found that at least 80 percent of enlisted personnel and 95 percent of officers said they had used the commissary in the previous month.

The 1985 DoD survey found that 60% of all enlisted soldiers were satisfied with the commissary, with 26% neutral, and 14% dissatisfied; for officers, the corresponding figures were 67%, 18%, and 15% (LaVange et al., 1986).

1985 DoD survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988) found nearly 90% of enlisted and over 90% of officers using the commissary at least a few times a year.

Commissary service was cited as a service most needing improvement by 8% of married soldiers, placing it fourth behind medical care, housing, and banking in the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj et al., 1991).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 45-46) in the 1987 ASAF survey found heavy use (97%) by spouses of the commissary but only moderate levels of satisfaction (62%), especially OCONUS (48%).

Bowen (1989, AF&S) found moderate correlations (.19 to .37) between satisfaction with commissary services and satisfaction with the military as a way of life among Army personnel, enlisted or officers, with or without children, married to either a military or a civilian spouse.

#### Exchange facilities.

The main exchange retail store was cited by 8% of never married soldiers (ranking it third), 5% of soldiers with civilian wives (ranking it fifth), and 7% of divorced/separated soldiers (ranking it fourth) as the service most needing improvement in the Army in the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj et al., 1991).



Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 45-46) in the 1987 ASAF survey found heavy use (97%) of post exchange facilities by spouses, but only moderate levels of satisfaction (55%) with low levels of satisfaction OCONUS (41%).

### Health Care Services

Medical care is a topic of great concern in the Army community. The Army Science Board (1989, p. ii) found that "Medical care is insufficient to meet all the needs of Army families. Army medical facilities are overburdened. Soldiers don't know how to use the CHAMPUS system." Specifically, the ASB found that soldiers often had to wait months for appointments and then waiting for hours to be treated; furthermore, female spouses and soldiers were having difficulty getting timely annual gynecological exams and pap smears in addition to concerns about their medical care during pregnancy, particularly at smaller hospitals and clinics. Concerns were voiced about CHAMPUS payments which often took up to two months, leaving families with cash flow problems. The ASB noted (1989, p. 27) that "Disillusionment about medical care was the most common problem heard throughout the Panel investigation."

The 1985 DoD survey for the Army found that 58% of all enlisted soldiers were satisfied with medical care, with 20% neutral, and 23% dissatisfied (LaVange, McCalla, Gabel, Rakoff, Doering, & Mahoney, 1986); for officers, the corresponding percentages were 56%, 17%, and 27% (Doering & Mahoney, 1987). Doering & Mahoney (1987) report more specific information by family type on percent soldiers rating quality of care and availability of care for soldier and for spouse/dependents as good or excellent. With respect to quality of care, the percentages for enlisted and officer unmarried soldiers with no children were 51% and 62%, respectively, for the soldier. With respect to availability of medical care for soldiers, the percentages of good to excellent ratings were 60% (enlisted unmarried, no children) and 68% (officers, unmarried, no children). Rating percentages for quality of medical care by married enlisted and officer personnel for themselves were 48% (enlisted, no children), 49% (enlisted, children), 59% (officer, no children), and 61% (officer, children); the corresponding ratings for availability of medical care were 58%, 58%, 66%, and 67%.

With respect to medical care for spouse/dependents, the 1985 DoD survey data showed good to excellent ratings for availability of medical care for married enlisted personnel of 41% (no children) and 42% (children) and for married officer personnel of 45% (no children) and 44% (children); the corresponding figures for quality of medical care for spouse/dependents were 38%, 39%, 46%, and 47%. Bowen & Neenan (1990) found that satisfaction with



medical care was associated with satisfaction with the military as a way of life for spouses regardless of whether their soldier was enlisted or officer or had children or not.

Kralj et al. (1991) found that in USAREUR between 34% (divorced/separated families) and 42% (dual military families) of soldiers rated their military medical care as good to very good, while 31% to 33% rated it as adequate. Between 27% and 33% rated it as poor to very poor. Medical care was cited more often than any other service as needing improvement in the 1986 USAREUR survey.

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey, spouses were more often satisfied (55%) with the availability of medical care than dissatisfied (45%).

Bowen (1989, AF&S) found moderate correlations (.25 to .37) between soldier satisfaction with medical care and satisfaction with the military as a way of life among officers and enlisted (married to a civilian or military spouse, with or without children) personnel sampled from the U. S. Army in the 1985 DoD survey.

Burnam et al. (1992) in their analysis of 1987 RAND survey data that 81% of soldiers had used Army medical care within the past six months with users using it an average of 5 times. Higher use of medical care was associated with junior enlisted rank, female gender, non-Black racial heritage, higher emotional

well-being, older age, belonging to a two-parent family, being located in CONUS, being located at a rural installation or a smaller base, and not being from a combat unit.

Vernez et al. (1989) reported that 37% of soldiers and 40% of spouses reported the overall quality of health care received as only fair to poor. Most complaints appeared to center around the time required to get an appointment, to wait to see a doctor or to obtain services rather than the technical skills of the doctors or their personal manners.

Vernez & Zellman (1987, p. 38) cite a study by Sterling & Allen (1983) in which satisfaction with medical services was the strongest correlate of several variables with career intentions, for both enlisted and officer personnel. An earlier survey had found medical care to be an important influence for the retention of junior officers (Army, Department of Personnel Management Development Directorate, 1973).

While 90% of spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey used Army medical facilities, satisfaction was only moderate at best (47%) with much (36%) dissatisfaction with the availability of medical

care (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 47-48). Spouses provided detailed reports of satisfaction with medical care as follows:

<u>Concern</u>	<u>% Satisfied</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Attitude of doctors	58%	23% dissatisfied
English speaking ability of doctors	80%	
Attitude of support staff	52%	26% dissatisfied
Time waiting between first appointment and seeing doctor	35%	49% dissatisfied
Time required to fill prescriptions	63%	74% satisfied OCONUS compared to 58% in CONUS
Hours of operation	63%	67% satisfied in CONUS versus 58% OCONUS
Availability of medical records	73%	
Overall quality of care	49%	31% dissatisfied

In general, officers' spouses were more satisfied with medical care than spouses of enlisted personnel by 5 to 9 percentage points.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, 59 to 62% of spouses rated the availability of Army medical care as supportive, but at the same time 23 to 24% rated it as unsupportive. The equivalent percentages for quality of Army medical care treatment were 56 to 62% and 23 to 25%.

#### Emergency services.

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 25% and 12% of all soldiers had used emergency room services in either an Army or civilian facility, respectively, in the past six months, while the corresponding percentages for Army spouses were 38% and 20%. Junior enlisted were more likely to have used civilian emergency services (16%) than were senior enlisted (9%) or officers (7%). Officers (28%) and enlisted (31%) with children were more likely to have used emergency services than those without children.

#### Ambulatory care services.

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 50% and 20% of all soldiers had visited a medical doctor for a physical problem in an Army or civilian setting within the past six months, compared to 54% and 41% of spouses. Comparable percentages, respectively, for visiting a medical doctor for preventive care were 25%, 8%, 38%, and 29%. Those soldiers with children, especially enlisted single parents, were somewhat more likely to have consulted with a medical doctor for physical problems or preventive care.

#### Hospital (inpatient) care.

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 6% and 4% of all soldiers had, for physical problems, stayed at an Army or civilian hospital, respectively, in the previous six months compared to 11% and 13% of spouses. In terms of hospital stays for emotional problems, about 2% of all soldiers and 4% of all spouses had received care in an Army or civilian hospital in the previous six months. Soldiers with children were more likely to have used hospital care than soldiers without children.

#### Hospital social services.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, 23 - 36% of spouses rated hospital social services as supportive compared to 9 - 11% that rated them as unsupportive.

#### Dental care.

Bowen (1989, AF&S; Bowen & Neenan, 1990) found moderate correlations (.18 to .24) between satisfaction with dental care and satisfaction with the military as a way of life among officers and enlisted personnel, in several family configurations, sampled from the U. S. Army for the 1985 DoD survey.

Vernez et al. (1989) from 1987 RAND data report that 53% and 8% of all soldiers had used an Army or civilian dental clinic, compared to 42% and 26% of spouses, respectively within the past six months. Officers were slightly more likely to use Army dental clinics (59%) compared to enlisted (52%). Officers and enlisted with children were more likely to have used dental care services than those without children.

1985 DoD survey data show 61% of all enlisted soldiers satisfied with dental care, with 20% neutral, and 19% dissatisfied; officer percentages were, respectively, 52, 16, and 32 (LaVange et al., 1986).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 47-48) from the 1987 ASAF survey reported that satisfaction with availability of dental care was

only moderate (43%), with satisfaction higher OCONUS (51%) than in CONUS (38%).

#### CHAMPUS.

In the 1987 ASAF survey of spouses, 49% of spouses indicated that they had used CHAMPUS within the past three years; of those, 63% were satisfied and 23% dissatisfied. Use was slightly higher in CONUS (53%) than OCONUS (44%).

#### Education

The 1987 ASAF survey of Army spouses (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 86-89) found most OCONUS students enrolled in Department of Defense Dependents (DODD) schools (79%) with another 12% enrolled in off-post public schools while most students in CONUS were enrolled in off-post public schools (71%) with others in public schools on-post (13%) or in section 6 schools (10%). Overall, Griffith et al. (1988) found three-fourths of spouses satisfied with the quality of education of the schools that their children were attending. Satisfaction was highest with attendance policies (88%) and curriculum (78%) but much lower with scholarship information (49%), bus monitoring (49%), summer school programs (48%), as well as school lunch programs and sports programs. Spouses of officers tended to be more satisfied with off-post public schools (77%) and private/parochial schools (90%) than were spouses of enlisted personnel, at 71% for both types of schools.

#### DODD schools.

According to Vernez & Zellman (1987) DoD operates 270 schools in 20 countries around the world, with a total enrollment of approximately 142,000 students.

Doering & Mahoney (1987) cite 1985 DoD survey data for all military services that reflected 44% of enlisted personnel married to a civilian spouse and 52% of officers married to a civilian spouse rating the quality of schools for dependents as good to excellent.

Vernez & Zellman (1987) summarize previous research on DODD schools in which parents and students report dissatisfaction with the condition of school facilities, overcrowding, and inadequate funding. However, one study found no relationship between satisfaction with schools and retention intentions (Bartell, O'Mara, & Hooke, 1983).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 86-89) reported that spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey cited DODD schools as the most common type of school used overseas (79%). Satisfaction with DODD schools varied, however, between spouses of officers (61% satisfied) and

enlisted (73% satisfied). While spouses of officers were relatively satisfied with attendance policies (80% satisfied), curriculum (68%), quality of teaching (61%), and placement of students (60%), they were less satisfied with programs for gifted students (44%), school sports programs (46%), special education programs (43%), and summer school programs (13%).

The Army Science Board (1989, pp. 38-40) observed that Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DODDS) often operated in overcrowded, substandard facilities, citing examples of terribly poor conditions (e.g., no bathroom facilities in some remote schools). However, DODD schools were viewed favorably when involvement and collaboration with parents and the military community were high.

Dependent schools were cited by 6% of family members married to military personnel as the facility providing the best family support in the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj, et al., 1991). When rated by family members on a five point satisfaction scale, DoDD schools generally came close to "satisfied" (4.0) or neutral (3.0) ratings: curriculum (3.67), school-community relations (3.61), attendance policy (3.94), school bus transportation (3.50), school facilities (3.39), student discipline (3.39), student discipline on buses (2.98), supplies/materials (3.52), meal program (2.67), and varsity sports (3.42).

The 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey found that for spouses 67% were satisfied with DODD schools while 21% were dissatisfied.

The 1991 USAREUR family survey found that most spouses were satisfied with DODDS during DESERT STORM in terms of the school (79%), the administrators (70%), and the teachers (79 - 81%); for unknown reasons, satisfaction with counselors was somewhat lower (58%, spouses of deployed soldiers; 66%, spouses of non-deployed soldiers).

#### Section 6 schools.

Section 6 schools are run by the federal government at a minority of posts within CONUS.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 86-89) found in their analysis of 1987 ASAF survey data that 10% of spouses in CONUS had children attending section 6 schools. Section 6 schools received relatively high satisfaction ratings from spouses compared to other types of schools in the 1987 ASAF survey.

#### Army Continuing Education System (ACES)

According to the 1984 MWR survey, ACES was used by about a third of officers and just over half of enlisted personnel (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). ACES includes a wide variety of programs, such as high school completion program, Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) improvement program, vocational skills development courses, two and four year college degree programs, English as a second language program, Headstart foreign language training, tuition assistance, College Level Exam Program (CLEP) testing, and master degree programs. Among those participating in ACES programs, 79% expressed satisfaction, only 7% dissatisfaction. However, one especially notable area that received lower satisfaction ratings was the Headstart language training program at less than 63% satisfied, even though it was used by 11% of respondents.

#### Recreation Services (MWR)

Bonito (1986) provided data from the 1985 DoD Survey on availability and dissatisfaction with recreational programs by married personnel. Very few personnel were unaware of the availability of recreational programs: 10%, enlisted CONUS; 6%, enlisted OCONUS; 9%, officer CONUS; 4%, officer OCONUS. Most personnel who were aware of such programs indicated that they were available on-post (94% - 96%). Only 5% - 10% of all personnel who had used or knew of recreational programs expressed dissatisfaction with them.

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) it was found that 67% of soldiers and 59% of spouses had used recreation services at their current location, with higher use among officers (77%) than enlisted (65%). There were no significant differences in usage between off-post (67%) and on-post (68%) soldiers. Differences in use varied little among geographic regions. Services received high percentages of "very useful" ratings from soldiers (66%) and their spouses (71%), especially from users (76%/80%) rather than non-users (49%/58%).

Furthermore, the 1990 SSMP data (CFSC, 1991) revealed that 63% of enlisted personnel and 65% of officers were satisfied with recreation services; only 9% of officers and 9% of enlisted personnel reported dissatisfaction with recreation services. In addition, over 90% of senior NCOs and senior commanders surveyed felt that recreation services were moderately, very, or extremely important to their unit's morale while over 80% felt they were slightly, moderately, very, or extremely important to their own individual morale.

In a telephone survey of soldiers and spouses in 1989 RTI (1990) found that on-post recreational facilities were seen as more convenient (44%/27%) and less costly (69%/62%) than equivalent civilian facilities off-post.

### Recreation centers. (MWR)

While less than 10% of officers used recreation centers at least twice a month or more, nearly 40% of enlisted did so, according to the 1984 MWR survey with another 30-40% of officers and enlisted personnel using recreation centers at least a few times a year (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988), although use was higher in Germany or Korea than in CONUS. Recreation centers appeared to be used about 34% more by first term soldiers than others accordingly to Vernez & Tharrington (1988)'s analysis of SSMP data for 1985 and the 1984 MWR survey. Sixty percent of users indicated satisfaction with their recreation center. Among specific sources of dissatisfaction was operating hours (10% poor or very poor) and lack of courtesy by staff.

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 37% of soldiers and 22% of spouses used military recreation centers within the previous six months. Recreation center use was highest among junior enlisted (44%) and in Korea (63%), among soldiers; differences for spouses were much smaller.

Use of recreation centers was cited frequently (55%) by spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45) with 74% of users satisfied. Use appeared to be slightly higher OCONUS than in CONUS.

The spring 1990 SSMP found that recreation centers were used at least occasionally by 61% of enlisted personnel and 39% of officers (CFSC, 1991). Use was slightly higher for junior enlisted than for senior enlisted and for junior rather than senior officers. Enlisted personnel tended to use recreation centers for competitions and social activities while officers used them for classes and special interest clubs, as well as social activities.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, less than a third of families reporting using their community recreation center, although satisfaction was high (53 to 66% satisfied and only 12 to 14% dissatisfied). Spouses of deployed soldiers more often said that their use had increased since DESERT STORM (39 to 17%).

### Indoor recreational sports. (MWR)

According to Vernez & Tharrington (1988), indoor sports (primarily in the gym) were used by over 50% of both enlisted and officer personnel at least twice a month, with another 15-20% of all personnel using indoor sports facilities at least a few times a year. The largest number of complaints mentioned in the survey dealt with quality, variety, and availability of equipment (16 - 20% dissatisfied).

Use of post gymnasiums was cited as high (56%) by spouses in



the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45), with 80% of users satisfied. Use was slightly higher OCONUS than in CONUS.

Burnam et al. (1992) report from 1987 RAND survey data that over 59% of soldiers had used indoor athletic facilities or activities (labeled as gym) within the past six months and that users used it an average of 28 times within the past six months. Greater use of the gym was associated with male gender, younger age, being Black, having more education, reporting higher emotional well-being, being single, and location at a smaller size installation.

#### Bowling. (MWR)

In the 1984 MWR survey, bowling was used at least two times a month by only 10-15% of all personnel, though at least a few times a year by a total of 50% of enlisted personnel and just over a third of officers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Bowling services were used more OCONUS than CONUS in the 1984 MWR survey. For officers primarily off-post residence was associated with a 29% less use of bowling (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Over half of respondents (56%) reported being satisfied with their local Army bowling center, with only 11% dissatisfied. The most frequent complaint reported was time to wait to bowl (20%) followed by poor quality of equipment (14%).

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey soldiers said they had visited the bowling center within the past month (40%) or from one to six times within the past year (51%); satisfaction levels were high (62% satisfied) with low levels of dissatisfaction (10%).

According to Vernez et al. (1989), 38% of soldiers and 29% of spouses used bowling services within the previous six months. Bowling was most popular among junior enlisted (43%) and in Korea (52%) and Germany (44%) among soldiers.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, over half (51 - 52%) of families reported using the bowling center, with use slightly greater after the DESERT STORM deployment. Most (67 - 72%) of spouses reported being satisfied with the bowling center compared to the few (9 - 11%) who reported dissatisfaction.

#### Arts and crafts. (MWR)

Used more than two times a month by only 10% or so of officers and enlisted personnel according to the 1984 MWR survey,



arts and crafts were used even only occasionally (a few times a year) by less than 50% of officers and enlisted personnel (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). In the 1984 MWR survey, most arts and crafts use represented soldiers working with auto repair and body shops and woodworking. For officers only, off-post location reduced arts and craft use by 29%. Arts and crafts also appeared to be used 40% less frequently by first term soldiers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Arts and crafts were also used more by married than by single soldiers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Satisfaction ratings were much higher for enlisted personnel (50%) and males (52%) than for officers (8%) and females (7%), though dissatisfaction was seldom reported (1 - 7%). The most significant source of dissatisfaction appeared to be operating hours (16% poor or very poor).

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 12% of soldiers and 12% of spouses used arts and crafts services within the past six months. Auto craft had been used by 26% of soldiers and 9% of spouses. Auto craft was more popular in Germany than in CONUS or Korea. but arts and crafts were most popular in Korea (22%) among soldiers.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, a moderate percentage (29 - 32%) of spouses reported using the arts and crafts facility, for which use appeared to increase after the DESERT STORM deployment. Satisfaction levels were relatively high (59 - 70%) with few spouses dissatisfied (9 - 19%). In the same survey, the auto craft shop was used by 27 to 31% of families, with use substantially greater since the DESERT STORM deployment, especially for families of deployed soldiers (49% reporting increased use). While ten percent of families were dissatisfied with the auto craft shop, more (64 to 67%) were satisfied with it.

#### Music and theater.(MWR)

Fewer than 5% of enlisted and officers reported using music and theater more than twice a month according to the 1984 MWR survey while less than 25% of enlisted and only just over 25% of officers even used them a few times a year (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Music and theater services were used more OCONUS than in CONUS in the 1984 MWR survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Off-post location reduced music and theater use by 20% for enlisted and by 24% for officers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Officers were more likely to use music and theater than enlisted personnel (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). The most common response on the satisfaction item was neutral (49%) rather than satisfied (41%) or dissatisfied (10%). Quite a few respondents (8%) didn't even know music and theater activities existed, suggesting that improved marketing could increase use of these general services.

Vernez et al. (1989) report that 29% of soldiers and 25% of

spouses used music and theater within the previous six months. Among soldiers, music and theater was most popular among junior enlisted (36%) and OCONUS (39%) rather than officers and senior enlisted (23%) or in CONUS (21%). For spouses, such differences were much less pronounced.

Music and drama facilities were used by 14 - 17% of families in the 1991 USAREUR family survey, the lowest percentage of use of the MWR facilities evaluated. Use did not change much with the DESERT STORM deployment. In spite of their low use, many spouses were satisfied (57 - 59%) with their music and drama facilities, though some were not (9 - 13%).

#### Outdoor recreation (MWR).

According to the 1984 MWR survey, over 50% of officers and just under 50% of enlisted personnel used outdoor sports facilities more than two times a month. An additional 20 - 25% of all personnel used the outdoor facilities at least a few times a year (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Nearly 96% of respondents indicated that they intended to use the outdoor recreational program in the future. Notably, in contrast to other services, soldiers in Germany and Korea used outdoor sports and outdoor recreation less than soldiers in CONUS as reported in the 1984 MWR survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Poor quality, availability, and variety of equipment were the most frequent sources of dissatisfaction with outdoor athletic activities (13 - 15%) and outdoor recreational activities (10 - 12%). Approximately 57% of users were satisfied with their local outdoor recreational activities, with only 13% dissatisfied.

According to Vernez et al. (1989), 37% of soldiers and 17% of spouses used outdoor athletic services within the previous six months. However, they found (in partial contrast to the 1984 MWR survey) that outdoor athletics was more popular in Korea (48%) and CONUS (40%) than in Germany (29%).

Although relatively few families in the 1991 USAREUR family survey reported using an outdoor recreation center (18% of those with a deployed sponsor and 30% of those with a nondeployed sponsor), use was relatively unchanged since DESERT STORM and satisfaction levels were moderately high (68 - 69%) with only 8 - 10% dissatisfied.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, relatively few families reported using the rod and gun club (13 - 19%), second lowest use except for music and drama facilities. Use appeared to decrease after deployment, although most families (53%) were satisfied

with the rod and gun club and few (10 - 14%) were dissatisfied.

#### Installation special events.

RTI (1990) found that most soldiers (73%) and spouses (71%) were aware that their installation had sponsored special recreational or entertainment events during the past year. Of those who knew of such events, most soldiers/spouses (70%/72%) had attended at least one event. Nearly 80% of soldiers and spouses who were not aware of such events said they would attend if such events were to be offered. Surprisingly, the major advantage cited for attending special events on-post was the chance to see and be with other soldiers and families (51%/55%), while low cost was cited far less often (19%/12%).

#### Military clubs.

According to the 1984 MWR survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988) over 25% of both enlisted and officer personnel used clubs more than once a month with approximately an additional 50% of both groups using clubs less frequently. Club use was higher OCONUS than in CONUS in the same survey. Satisfaction levels were mixed by rank with the following ranks reporting satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their local club: E1 - E4, 49%/20%; E5 - E9, 49%/24%; officers, 42%/34%. It appears that dissatisfaction increased with rank. For officers especially, quality of food (29%) and quality of entertainment (44%) were rated as poor or very poor. On the positive side, respondents were relatively satisfied with amount of dues, hours of operation, appearance and cleanliness, quality of beverages, beverage and food prices, and quality of service.

In the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj, et al., 1991) clubs were cited by 7% of never married soldiers as a service/facility most needing improvement and ranked fourth in such importance after banking, medical care, and the PX.

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey, clubs were used at least monthly by 45% of soldiers and one to six times a year by another 47% of soldiers. Forty-six percent of soldiers were satisfied with clubs while 26% were dissatisfied.

The 1987 RAND survey (Burnam et al., 1992) found that 48% of soldiers had used clubs within the past six months; users had visited their club an average of 15 times in that timeframe. Clubs were more likely to be used by officers than enlisted personnel, by blacks more than whites, by older soldiers, by single soldiers, by soldiers working longer hours, and by soldiers stationed OCONUS.

RTI's (1990) telephone survey of soldiers and spouses on clubs found lower cost (40%/32%), convenient location (30%/23%),

camaraderie (23%/21%), and safety (21%/15%) cited as advantages relative to civilian off-post clubs.

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, clubs were used by 46 to 57% of families. The effect of deployment was notable; among those whose soldier deployed, 23% reported increased and 35% reported decreased use of clubs, while usage remained relatively unchanged among those whose sponsor did not deploy (64% did not change). However, satisfaction with clubs was not associated with deployment as 48% to 50% reported satisfaction with clubs (with 28 to 31% reporting dissatisfaction).

#### General Services - Relocation

Regardless of the services available to support relocation, it must be kept in mind that relocation often costs Army families substantial out-of-pocket costs, partly due to low weight allowances for moving. For example, Griffith et al. (1988, p. 30) in their analysis of the 1987 ASAF survey of spouses found that 51% of spouses reported unreimbursed expenses of \$500 or more on their most recent PCS move, with 12% reporting such expenses of \$2,000 or more. Only 23% of spouses reported no unreimbursed expenses. Officers' spouses reported higher unreimbursed expenses - 42% versus 26% enlisted reporting such expenses of \$1,000 or more on the last move. In view of this problem, relocation services assume even greater importance.<sup>7</sup>

#### Community orientation.(ACS)

Orthner et al. (1985) found that less than ten percent of spouses recalled participating in an orientation program at Fort Benning.

Vernez et al. (1989) from 1987 RAND survey results report that 22% of soldiers and 25% of their spouses received welcome packets after their move, with 45% of soldiers and 20% of spouses attending a welcome/orientation at their new post. Whereas for premove information, it was clear that officers had an advantage, for post-move information, there were either no differences or slight differences in favor of enlisted personnel.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 25-26) reported that 78% of spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey reported having used welcome packets during their last PCS move. Use was slightly higher

---

<sup>7</sup> Schumm, Bell, & Tran (1992a) provide additional data on unreimbursed relocation expenses from several previous, though small scale, research projects.

among officer spouses (83%) than among spouses of enlisted personnel (77%). More spouses were satisfied (62%) than dissatisfied (24%) with their welcome packets although officer spouses were more likely to be satisfied (73%) than enlisted spouses (58%) and satisfaction was somewhat lower for OCONUS than CONUS spouses (no percentages reported).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 25-26) also report results from the 1987 ASAF survey with respect to installation and unit orientations, used by 59% and 57% of spouses, respectively. Use was higher OCONUS, though Griffith et al. (1988) do not provide exact percentages. Satisfaction with installation and unit orientations was mixed: only 40% and 35% of spouses were satisfied with those services, respectively, while 38% and 43% were dissatisfied with them. Spouses of officers were most likely to report satisfaction with unit orientation (42%) compared to spouses of enlisted (33%). Furthermore, spouses of enlisted personnel OCONUS were even more often dissatisfied (43%) with unit orientation.

RTI (1990) found that between 10% and 20% of soldiers and spouses were aware of welcome packets and community orientations. Between 5% and 15% of soldiers or spouses rated these programs as valuable.

The AFRP survey (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992) found that 24-27% of soldiers and 20-25% of spouses had used the community orientation service at their current installation, with use higher among officers (31%) than among enlisted (22%). Use was also higher among off-post personnel (26%) than among on-post personnel (22%). Use was found to be greater in Europe (37%) and other OCONUS (20%) sites than in CONUS (18%) (Bell, 1992b). Croan et al. (1991) report that 52% of soldiers and 65% of spouses found the service "very useful."

#### Lending closet. (ACS)

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 25-26) in their analysis of the 1987 ASAF survey found that 51% of spouses had used the lending closet, with higher use among enlisted spouses (53%) than among officer spouses (43%) and with higher use OCONUS (64%) than in CONUS (34%). Spouse satisfaction with the lending closet service was relatively high (63% satisfied versus only 14% dissatisfied). Without citing exact percentages, Griffith et al. (1988) noted that satisfaction with the lending closet was even higher OCONUS than in CONUS.

The AFRP survey (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992) found that 20-24% of soldiers and 28-34% of spouses had used the service at their current location, with use being higher among officers (28%) than enlisted (19%) and higher for off-post soldiers (24%) than for on-post soldiers (17%). Devine et al.

(1992) state that use was higher in Europe (27%) and other OCONUS sites (22%) than in CONUS (17%). The lending closet service was cited as "very useful" by 59% of soldiers and 67% of spouses (Croan et al., 1991).

RTI's (1990) telephone survey of soldiers and spouses found the lending closet to be the most widely recognized ACS program (48% soldiers/42% spouses). The lending closet program was cited as one of the most important ACS programs by more than 25% of the RTI respondents.

#### Premove information.(ACS)

Vernez et al. (1989) from 1987 RAND survey results report that 13% of soldiers were briefed about their new post prior to their move, 13% received information about the new post from their sponsor prior to their move, 23% received a welcome packet prior to the move; for spouses, the comparable percentages were 8%, 14%, and 20%. In general, officers and their spouses were more likely to receive such premove information than were enlisted personnel and their spouses.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 25-26) discuss overseas orientation which was reported as used by 63% of spouses of soldiers stationed OCONUS. However, satisfaction with this premove information was mixed, with 37% satisfied and 41% dissatisfied.

Croan et al., (1991) and Devine et al. (1992) report that in the AFRP survey 20-24% of soldiers and 24-28% of spouses had used the service at their current installation. Since premove information may not be needed until the soldier is about to leave the installation, the figures here may underestimate the percentage of personnel who will use the service before they PCS elsewhere. Use was higher among officers (37%) than enlisted (17%) and for off-post personnel (23%) than for on-post personnel (18%). Use varied little (19-22%) by geographic region (Bell, 1992b). Premove information was cited as "very useful" by 56% of soldiers and 70% of spouses (Croan et al., 1991).

#### Relocation counseling.(ACS)

In a study of ten installations worldwide by Croan & Orthner (1987) it was found that very few soldiers or spouses were taking advantage of ACS relocation assistance programs.

The AFRP survey (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992) found much the same thing. Only 7-8% of soldiers and 6-7% of spouses had used relocation counseling, which may be an underestimate of true use if relocation counseling is done mostly for soldiers before they depart an installation. If relocation counseling is intended to be used by soldiers just

after arriving at a new installation, the above reports of use are probably not underestimated. Use did not vary by rank or on-post/off-post location or by geographic region. More than 5% of soldiers and 3% of spouses rated relocation counseling as "not useful." In fact, it was one of very few services that failed to receive a 90% rating of at least "somewhat useful." According to Croan et al. (1991), relocation counseling received "very useful" ratings from only 44% of soldiers and 51% of spouses, the lowest ratings of any relocation service.

#### Sponsorship assistance. (ACS)

The Army leadership is concerned about sponsorship. The Army Science Board (1989, p. 20) concluded for its sponsor, LTG Ono, that "Results of Army-based evaluations and the Family Panel's investigation show that the Sponsorship Program has a very uneven effectiveness record. The overall program seems to be the least effective for lower enlisted personnel, who have the greatest need." and "It appears to the Family Panel that the problems are currently unsolvable because the sponsorship program itself is based on invalid assumptions, i.e. that assignments are known in advance and not changed."

According to the 1985 DoD survey (Army), sponsorship services were used by less than 50% of enlisted personnel though by nearly 80% of officers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Vernez & Tharrington (1988) analyzed 1986 Army SSMP data and found that 57% of enlisted personnel did not have a sponsor assigned at all compared to only 21% of officers; furthermore, sponsors were reported to be helpful for nearly two thirds of officers but for less than one third of enlisted personnel. Sponsors were used more for enlisted personnel in Germany but less in Korea than in CONUS. Married soldiers were somewhat more likely to use sponsorship programs than were single soldiers (although this might be an artifact of higher use of officers, who are more likely to be married than enlisted) (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988).

In the 1987 RAND survey it was found that effective relocation assistance was correlated with reduced rates of depression among soldiers (a 50% change in effectiveness of relocation assistance was associated with a 6% reduction in percent soldiers depressed) (Burnam et al., 1992).

Vernez et al. (1989) from 1987 RAND survey data found that 74% of officers were assigned a sponsor compared to 46% of senior enlisted and 38% of junior enlisted personnel. Support units were more likely to assign sponsors than combat units (54% versus 40%). Units in Germany were more likely to assign sponsors, especially after the soldier arrived in Germany whereas sponsorship was less common in Korea. Married officers were more likely to request a sponsor in advance and to be assigned one than were single officers, but rates differed little among



family types of enlisted personnel.

Griffith et al. (1988, p. 27) report results for sponsorship programs as evaluated by spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey. While the spouses of officers OCONUS reported high rates of sponsorship (69% - 84%), rates in general were lower for officer (57 - 68%) and enlisted (35 - 37%) spouses and for CONUS families. Of those spouses with a child between age 6 and 17, fewer than 17% reported having had a youth sponsor. Satisfaction with sponsors was moderate: 51 - 55% at least somewhat to very helpful (satisfaction with youth sponsors was much lower, 77% rated a little helpful or not helpful at all). Satisfaction was higher for spouses of officers (44% very helpful) than for spouses of enlisted (28% very helpful). While Griffith et al. (1988) do not report exact percentages, they note that satisfaction with sponsorship was slightly higher OCONUS than in CONUS.

The AFRP survey (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992) found that 24-28% of soldiers and 21-25% of spouses had used the service, with use much higher among officers (51%) than enlisted (20%), as well as off-post soldiers (29%) than on-post soldiers (21%). Use was greater in Europe (31%) and other OCONUS sites (27%) than in CONUS (21%). Sponsorship assistance was one of very few areas that failed to be rated at least "somewhat useful" by at least 90% of soldiers and received more than 5% ratings as "not useful" from soldiers and more than 3% such ratings from spouses; it was rated as "very useful" by 58% of soldiers and 64% of spouses (Croan et al., 1991).

### Targeted Services

#### Army Community Services (General).

At each installation, ACS is mandated to provide information and referral, consumer affairs and financial services, exceptional family member, foster care, family advocacy services, and relocation assistance programs (Devine et al., 1992).

In the 1984 MWR survey, ACS was used even occasionally by less than 25% of enlisted personnel and by only about a third of officers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). However, in 1984 ACS services were not well known and have been more publicized since. In the 1984 MWR survey, rates of usage were higher in OCONUS than in CONUS locations for ACS. First term enlistees used ACS 44% less than other soldiers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Use of ACS by married soldiers was far more substantial than for single soldiers (137% greater) according to Vernez & Tharrington (1988). However, over 57% of survey respondents were satisfied with the ACS program.

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey 15% of soldiers reported



having used ACS within the past month, with another 57% having used them one to six times in the past year. Over half of the soldiers (52%) were satisfied with ACS with only 8% dissatisfied.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) in their analysis of 1987 ASAF survey data found that 55% of spouses had used ACS services and of those 80% had been satisfied with the services provided. Use was higher OCONUS (68%) than in CONUS (45%) for spouses of both officers and enlisted personnel. Families with children were somewhat more likely to use ACS services than those without children.

The AFRP survey asked several questions to assess global assessments of ACS/Chaplain family programs (Devine et al., 1992). In response to a question, "How good or bad are programs and services for families at this location?" 54% of officers and 45% of enlisted personnel responded "good" to "very good." At the same time, 16% of enlisted personnel and 13% of officers said "bad" or "very bad." By family type, it was found that 52% of single soldiers without children, 48% of single soldiers with children, and 38% of married soldiers (with or without children) responded that family programs were "good" to "very good."

However, when spouses were asked if going to a military service provider (ACS, chaplains, etc.) for help with a problem could hurt a soldier's military career, over twenty percent of spouses agreed it could.

Both soldiers and spouses were asked "To what extent can you count on staff of an Army service agency (e.g. ACS or chaplain) for help with a personal or family problem?" with the result that 40% of soldiers and 23% of spouses agreed they could to a "great" or "very great" extent. On the other hand, 10% of soldiers and 26% of spouses answered "slight extent" or "not at all." Notably, more enlisted soldiers responded favorably (great or very great extent) (41%) than did officers (34%). Married soldiers were more likely to respond favorably (41%) than were single soldiers (37%).

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey most spouses cited ACS as supportive (53 - 56% before DESERT STORM; 61 - 65% since DESERT STORM) with only 7%/5% citing it as unsupportive.

The Army Science Board (1989, p. 21) concluded that "Routinely throughout the Panel investigation, families and soldiers identified the ACS as the most visible and positive program available to assist soldiers and families with personal needs. ACS offers services to include personal financial counseling, household item loan closet, emergency food locker, junior enlisted community centers, and outreach efforts. All the services were mentioned by soldiers and families as being needed and used. Resources seemed to be scarce, particularly for

outreach efforts to contact those young families living far from the military post."

#### Budget counseling.(ACS)

Awareness of the availability of financial counseling varied considerably in the 1985 DoD survey data as reported by Bonito (1986); while few married enlisted personnel OCONUS were not aware of the service (18% compared to 25% of officers) as much as 35% of officers in CONUS (compared to 26% of enlisted) were not aware of the service's availability at their location. However, of those who were aware of such services, most personnel (86 - 94%) said the services were available on post. Dissatisfaction levels were fairly low for financial counseling (5 - 9%).

Financial counseling (which included income tax assistance) was the second most frequently used ACS service (after information and referral) among spouses (15%) in the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45). It had a high awareness rating even among spouses whose soldiers were E4s or below (75%). Its use varied by rank, however, as it was used by 22% of spouses of E4s or below but by only 5% of spouses of officers.

In the AFRP survey (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992) 12% of soldiers and 7-8% of spouses reporting using budget counseling service, which was used far more by enlisted personnel (13%) than officers (2%). Use of the service was not related significantly to geographical location or housing location. It was, as might be expected, related to ability to pay bills on time, with 8% use by those with no problems, 16% use by those 1-2 months behind in paying bills, and 23% use by those three or more months behind. In terms of usefulness, 46-47% of soldiers and 54-55% of spouses said budget counseling was "very useful." Soldiers who had used it were more positive (56% very useful) than those who had not (45% very useful) but there were no significant differences between users and non-users for spouses.

#### Crisis hotline.(ACS)

In the 1985 DoD survey less than one third of soldiers were aware of crisis referral services, including hotlines, and less than half of those who had used them were satisfied (Orthner et al., 1988).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) report very low use (less than 5%) of ACS crisis intervention services, including suicide prevention services, by Army spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey.

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) only 2.9% of

soldiers and 2.6% of spouses having used the service, with enlisted (3.0%) using it a bit more than officers (1.8%).<sup>8</sup> There were no differences on use as a function of geographical location or housing location. While 60% of soldiers and 74% of spouses saw the hotline as "very useful," there were no significant differences between users and non-users on perceived usefulness.

#### Emergency food. (ACS)

Devine et al. (1992) report that 4% of soldiers and 5% of spouses in the AFRP survey had used the emergency food service. Use was higher among enlisted (5%) than among officers (1%) but there were no geographical or housing location differences. The service was seen as "very useful" by 63% of soldiers and 76% of spouses; while soldier users were more favorable (74%) than non-users (63%), there were no user differences for spouses.

#### Emergency home furnishings. (ACS)

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) 7% of soldiers and 9% of spouses had used this service, with a higher rate of use among enlisted (8%) than among officers (4%) as well as higher rates at other OCONUS sites (12%) and Europe (11%) than in CONUS (5%). Use by off-post personnel was higher (9%) than by on-post personnel (6%). In terms of usefulness, 58% of soldiers and 70% of spouses described the service as "very useful," with user soldiers rating it higher (74%) than non-users (58%) (there were no user differences for spouses).

#### Emergency loan services. (ACS)

1987 RAND survey data (Burnam et al., 1992) show 16% of soldiers having used some form of financial assistance (counseling or assistance from ACS, chaplains, AER, or the Red Cross) within the past six months with users averaging 3 visits in that time. Greater use of financial assistance was associated with junior enlisted rank, younger age, being Black, having lower emotional well-being, being married with dependents, having experienced more separations, and belonging to a combat unit.

Soldiers in the 1987 RAND survey (Vernez et al., 1992) used chaplains (12%), ACS (28%), AER (24%), or the Red Cross (14%) for financial assistance or counseling. In terms of financial assistance per se, percentages and average dollar amounts were

<u>Source</u>	<u>Percent Soldiers</u>	<u>Average Dollar Amount</u>
AER	20.6%	422
Red Cross	8.6%	1157

<sup>8</sup> This difference was not statistically significant, however.

Civilian Services	8.8%	1861
Relatives/Friends	22.1%	874
From any source above	48.6%	851

Officers tended to receive more help from relatives/friends, civilian services, or AER while enlisted tended to receive more assistance from the Red Cross.

Martin (1992) has reported that 34 to 46% of Army families in the 1991 Survey of Army Families reported having had financial difficulties within the last six months.

Devine et al. (1992) report from the AFRP survey that 18% of soldiers and 21% of spouses have used the emergency loan service of ACS at their current location. The difference in use between officers (3%) and enlisted (20%) is quite dramatic. Use by off-post soldiers (21%) is higher than by on-post soldiers (15%). There were no geographical location differences in use. Use of the service was related, as might be expected, to difficulty in paying bills; use was 12% for those with no problems, 27% for those 1-2 months behind, and 31% for those three or more months behind. In terms of usefulness, 61% of soldiers saw the service as "very useful" along with 71% of the spouses. While there were no significant user differences for soldiers, spouses who had used the service gave it an 88% "very useful" rating compared to 67% of non-users.

#### Emergency long-distance phone calls.(ACS)

In the AFRP survey, 5% of soldiers and 4% of spouses had used the service at their current location (Devine et al., 1992), with use higher among enlisted (6%) than officers (2%). There were no differences in use based on geographical or housing location. Soldiers (59%) generally saw the service as "very useful," as did their spouses (69%). However, there were no significant differences related to use in terms of explaining perceived usefulness.

#### Utility waiver program.

One of the few sources to comment on policies in effect at some installations with respect to waiver of utility and rental deposits is the report by Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 28-29) on the 1987 ASAF survey in which 38% and 24% of spouses were aware of the utility deposit and rental deposit programs, respectively. Of those who were aware of the utility deposit program, 54% had used it, with higher use among spouses living off-post in rented housing (as might be expected).

#### Consumer Affairs Programs (ACS).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) in their analysis of 1987 ASAF survey data found that few spouses were aware of or had used ACS consumer affairs programs.

#### Financial class on preparing for PCS. (ACS)

Vernez et al. (1989) report from 1987 RAND survey data that 23% of all soldiers had ever attended financial classes, more often those assigned in Germany (28%) rather than CONUS (21%) or Korea (19%) or junior/senior enlisted (26%/23%) rather than officers (13%), or in combat units (25%) rather than support units (20%).

Orthner et al. (1988) cite results from the 1985 DoD Survey and the Families in Green (Orthner et al., 1985) study that indicated that most soldiers were aware of financial counseling (75% of soldiers and 67% of spouses in the 1985 DoD survey) and that 54% of those who received it were satisfied. In the Families in Green study, only 4 percent of soldiers and 6 percent of spouses had received financial counseling.

RTI (1990) in a telephone survey of soldiers and spouses found that 34% of soldiers and 23% of spouses were aware of this ACS program. Over 25% of RTI's respondents described financial counseling as one of ACS's most important programs.

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) 6% of soldiers and 4% of spouses had used the service, with use higher among enlisted (7%) than among officers (3%). There were no geographical or housing location differences. While there were also no user differences in perceived usefulness, 48% of soldiers and 55% of spouses perceived the service as "very useful."

#### Programs for Spouses

##### Employment programs.

In the 1985 DoD survey, soldiers were asked to rate the availability of federal government employment and of other civilian employment for spouses/dependents (Doering & Mahoney, 1987). Only those soldiers with civilian spouses responded, rating availability as good to excellent as follows: with respect to federal employment, 13% (enlisted, no children), 14% (enlisted, children), 15% (officers, with or without children) - with respect to other civilian employment, 23% (enlisted, no children), 19% (enlisted, children), 25% (officers, no children), and 23% (officers, with children). Bonito's (1986) analysis of the 1985 DoD survey revealed a moderately large percentage of personnel being unaware of spouse employment programs (21 - 24% OCONUS), especially in CONUS (37% enlisted, 47% officers). Of those who were aware of such services, relatively few, compared

to other services, thought the services were available on post (64 - 73% CONUS; 79 - 85% OCONUS). Notably, dissatisfaction levels were higher for spouse employment services than for any other support service analyzed by Bonito (1986): 37 - 45% of soldiers dissatisfied among those who had knowledge of or experience with the service. By way of comparison, the next most problematic area (child care services) had dissatisfaction levels of "only" 16 - 21%.

Coolbaugh, Perrine, & Griffith (1990) note that Family Member Employment Assistance Programs (FMEAP) are available under ACS at over 100 installations around the world, while there are approximately 155 Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs).

In their analysis of the 1986 USAREUR survey, Kralj et al. (1991) found that two thirds of soldiers' family members had never used the Family Member Employment Assistance Center; among those who had used it, most (10%) found it neither helpful nor unhelpful with 5% not finding it helpful and 3% finding it helpful. A similar pattern of results was found for the One Stop Employment Information Center, with nearly half of family members unaware of its existence and mixed results in terms of satisfaction for those who had used it.

Vernez et al. (1989) from 1987 RAND survey data report that nearly 50% of spouses used the Family Member Employment Service but that only 4% of those users found a job with FMES assistance (though 42% found a job with other Army assistance, usually the Civilian Personnel Office). Two-thirds of spouses rated the FMES service as only fair or poor. Among spouses who did not use the FMES at their current location but were looking for work over 57% had not heard of the service, 5% said the location was inconvenient, and 13% didn't think the service would help. The FMES appeared to be more effective in Germany than in CONUS or Korea as 6% of spouses found a job with FMES assistance in Germany compared to 3% in CONUS and 0% in Korea. Spouses of junior enlisted appeared to fare better (8%) than spouses of senior enlisted (4%) or officers (2%) in getting work through the FMES. However, ratings of FMES were similar across ranks and locations.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 28-29) reported relatively low awareness (37%) by spouses of Army policies to give preference to Army spouses for appointments to federal positions. Surprisingly, as of 1987, only 8% of spouses had knowingly taken advantage of the policy. Awareness of the policy was higher OCONUS and among the spouses of officers. Use of the AFMEA service was relatively low (16%) and only about 44% of users found the service helpful. Use of CPO services was higher (40%) and a bit more helpful (48%). Use of military friends was as high as CPO services (40%) but more often (70%) helpful.

Several research teams have reported finding relationships between spouse employment or income and soldier retention (Blankinship, Bullman, & Croan, 1990; Coolbaugh, Perrine, & Griffith, 1990; Wood, 1988).

#### Spouse employment referrals.(ACS)

Because spouse employment services are still evolving at each installation, use figures may be underestimated by AFRP data (Croan et al., 1991; Devine et al., 1992). In AFRP data, spouse employment referral was the most popular component of the ACS Family Member Employment Assistance Program, with 23-25% of spouses having used it (interestingly, only 19% of soldiers reported that their family had used the service, underestimating use compared to the spouse reports). Use varied with employment status, geographical location, education, and difficulty experienced in finding employment. Those spouses that had used the service most often were those looking for work (36%) followed by those currently employed (31%); spouses not in the labor force (12%) and those on active duty (5%) had used the service much less frequently. Spouses with a college degree (25%) or post-graduate work (25%) were more likely to have used the service than spouses with only a high school diploma (20%) or with only a GED or less than a high school education (12%). Spouses in Europe (29%) had used the program more often than those at other OCONUS sites (16%) or in CONUS (20%). Those spouses who reported that they had had a serious problem finding work had used the service more often (45%) compared to those who had somewhat of a problem finding work (37%) or who had no problem (20%). According to Croan et al. (1991), 47% of soldiers and 54% of spouses found spouse employment referrals to have been "very useful."

In terms of usefulness, 56% of soldiers and 64% of spouses rated spouse employment referral services as "very useful," while 13% of soldiers and 7% of wives rated it as "not useful."

#### Spouse career planning.(ACS)

Croan et al. (1991) and Devine et al. (1992) reported results of their analysis of AFRP survey data in which 7-8% of spouses had used spouse career planning (soldiers reported 6%). Use varied with spouse's employment status; spouses who were looking for work (11%) or those currently employed (8%) had used the service more often than those not in the labor force (4%) or those on active duty (5%). While 46-47% of soldiers and 53-54% of spouses found spouse career planning to be "very useful," 14-15% of soldiers and 8-9% of spouses saw it as "not useful."

#### Spouse employment skills training.(ACS)



Croan et al. (1991) and Devine et al. (1992) found from AFRP data that about 7% of spouses had used this service (soldiers reported use at 6%), whose use varied with spouse's employment status: looking for work (11%), employed (9%), not in the labor force (4%), and on active duty (3%). The service was seen as "very useful" by 51-52% of soldiers and 63-65% of spouses and as "not useful" by 13-14% of soldiers and 7-8% of spouses.

#### Special needs.

#### Programs for spouses during TDY/deployment. (ACS)

Bonito (1986) in his analysis of married soldiers' responses to the 1985 DoD survey found relatively low levels of awareness of services for families during separation (52 - 58% unaware), though of those who were aware, most recognized the services as being available on post (76 - 86%). Dissatisfaction levels were low to moderate relative to those of other services (11 - 19%) among those soldiers who knew of or had used the service.

Vernez et al. (1989) reported that, in the 1987 RAND survey, 29% of all married soldiers's spouses were invited to attend pre-deployment briefings at the last planned deployment; over 63% of those invited did attend. Participation rates were higher for combat units and for CONUS units. Vernez et al. (1989) report 1987 RAND survey data that indicated that 17% of spouses were invited to participate in the unit's family support group and that over 59% of those invited did participate. However, under 5% of spouses sought help from their FSG, although nearly 38% of those who did rated the help as good to excellent. Variations in satisfaction with help were dramatic: over 83% of officers' spouses with children rated the help as good to excellent compared to less than 23% of enlisted spouses without children. Female spouses were more often satisfied (36%) than male spouses (16%). Also, a higher percentage of officers' spouses were invited to participate (80% versus 58% for senior enlisted and 47% for junior enlisted).

Family support group services had been used by only 11% of spouses that were aware of them, according to Griffith et al.'s (1988, pp. 42-45) analysis of 1987 ASAF survey data.

Although fewer than 5% of spouses had used this service as reported in the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992), which was conducted prior to DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM, soldiers (58%) and spouses (66%) often rated it as "very useful."

In the 1991 USAREUR family survey, spouses rated "another unit spouse" as supportive to a greater extent than ACS, legal assistance, AER, Youth Activities, hospital social services, and army medical care. For spouses whose soldiers did not deploy another unit spouse was rated as supportive by 58 - 65% of



spouses; for spouses whose soldiers did deploy for DESERT STORM another spouse was rated as supportive by 74 - 83% of spouses.

#### Services for foreign-born spouses. (ACS)

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) in their analysis of 1987 ASAF survey data reported low levels of awareness and use of English language training for Army spouses.

AFRP data indicate minimal use of services for foreign-born spouses, less than 3% for enlisted personnel and less than 2% for officers with minimal differences for housing location or geographic region (Bell, 1992b).

#### Spouse abuse services. (ACS)

In the 1985 DoD survey, only 31% of enlisted Army wives and 20% of Army officers' wives were aware of shelter programs; of those who had used them, about half were satisfied (Orthner et al., 1988). Bonito's (1986) analysis of married soldiers with dependents in the 1985 DoD survey found that many in both CONUS (43 - 47%) and OCONUS (33 - 35%) were not aware of spouse or child abuse services. Of those who were aware of them, most identified them as being on post (86 - 93%). Relatively few soldiers who knew of or had experienced the services were dissatisfied with them (6 - 12%).

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) reported very low awareness and use of family advocacy ACS services in their analysis of data from the 1987 ASAF survey.

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) only 2% of spouses had used this service but 66% of soldiers and 79% of spouses saw such services as "very useful." Little variation occurred by housing location (2.4% off-post; 1.3% on-post) or by geographic region (2.4%, Europe; 1.9%, other OCONUS; 1.6% CONUS).

#### Outreach programs for families who live off-post. (ACS)

Awareness of outreach programs by spouses in the 1987 ASAF survey (Griffith et al., 1988, pp. 42-45) was as low as 39% for soldiers' spouses (ranking below E-5) and as high as 62% for spouses of senior NCOs. Only 8% of those aware of outreach programs had used them, however.

ACS outreach programs coordinate military and civilian support services for soldiers and their families who, by living off-post, may be handicapped in obtaining needed community support. However, less than two-thirds of installations may offer such programs (Devine et al., 1992). In the AFRP survey, 13% of enlisted and 16% of officer personnel had used outreach programs, with off-post use (19%) higher, as would be expected,

than use by on-post families (10%). Small geographic differences favored Europe (16%) over other OCONUS (11%) and CONUS (13%) locations (Bell, 1992b).

#### Services for off-post families.

Vernez & Tharrington (1988) in their secondary analysis of 1985 DoD survey data and the 1985 Army SSMP data found that off-post residence reduced use of a host of Army community support services by 4 to 20% for enlisted personnel and 8 to 30% for officers.

Off-post services are important because only about one third of Army families live on-post at any one time (Orthner, Duvall, & Stawarski, 1990; Robinson, 1988).

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) services for families living off-post had been used by 14% of soldiers and 18% of spouses, with higher use among those living off-post (19%) than on post (10%) and those living in Europe (16%) than in CONUS (12%) or other OCONUS sites (11%). Devine et al. (1992, p. 25) cite higher use among officers (16%) than enlisted personnel (13%).<sup>9</sup>

In terms of usefulness, 51% of soldiers and 67% of spouses rate the services as "very useful" with users more often reporting "very useful" ratings (61%/78%) than non-users (50%/64%). However, over 5% of soldiers and over 3% of spouses rate off-post services as "not useful," which may only reflect the fact they are probably not considered useful by many families living on-post.

#### Services for geographically-separated families. (ACS)

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 28-29) in the 1987 ASAF survey found that 38% of spouses were aware of the student travel program for Army families (in which the Army provides transportation for a student to travel home to his Army family OCONUS once a year) but only 4% of those aware of the program had used it. However, among those spouses with a child aged 18 - 20 years, those for whom the benefit is most applicable, 70% were aware of the program and 15% had used it.

In the AFRP survey (Bell, 1992b), services for the geographically separated were used by 8% of enlisted and 6% of officer personnel, with few differences by housing location or

---

<sup>9</sup> In an apparent discrepancy, Devine et al. (1992, p. 23) cite use rates of 49% for E2 through E4, 40% for E5 through E9, and 11% for all officers; however, such high percentages for enlisted should, if correct, translate into more than the 13% use rate for enlisted cited on page 25 of their report.

geographical region.

### Children and youth.

#### Child daycare. (CDS)

As of 1990 there were 690 Child Development Centers around the world (all military services) which together with family day care homes could provide care for nearly 130,000 children, which appeared to fall short of meeting demand by as many as 60,000 children.

Child Developmental Services were used more than 21 hours a week by only about 10% of officers and enlisted personnel, with only about a third of officers and a quarter of enlisted personnel using CDS at all; CDS were used less in Korea and Germany than in CONUS as reported in the 1984 MWR survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). According to Vernez & Tharrington (1988) off-post residence strongly suppresses use of child development services, especially for officers. Officers were more likely to use CDS than enlisted personnel, as were married personnel as opposed to single soldiers (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). Satisfaction with child care services was lower on average than other MWR services in the 1984 survey, with only about a third of CDS users reporting overall satisfaction or satisfaction with special aspects of child care (availability of full day care, availability of hourly care, fees, operating hours, quality of program, attitude of staff, attitude of management, and quality of staff).

Bonito (1986) in his analysis of 1985 DoD survey data for married soldiers with dependents found very few soldiers who were not aware of child care services (10% OCONUS, 14 - 19% in CONUS), with most of those aware of such services identifying them as being available on post (91 - 93%). However, dissatisfaction levels were rather high (16 - 21%) compared to other services, exceeded only by dissatisfaction with spouse employment services.

Childcare was cited by 7% of dual career family soldiers, ranking it fifth behind medical care, housing, banking, and commissary as the service needing most improvement in the 1986 USAREUR survey (Kralj et al., 1991). When asked what type of child care was most needed, enlisted soldiers tended to request full day childcare while officers tended to request hourly care; thus, Kralj et al. (1991, p. 40) comment that "... no single child development service will have a uniform impact and further work is needed to define the most cost effective set of services for a community."

In the 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey spouses were split evenly on satisfaction (51%) and dissatisfaction (49%) with availability of quality child care facilities. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction percentages varied by type of child care, according to the spouses as follows:

<u>Type Child Care</u>	<u>Percent Satisfied</u>	<u>Percent Dissatisfied</u>
Family Day Care	30	38
Preschool Care	46	24
Before and After School Care	33	29
Hourly Care	34	39
Family Care in Quarters	43	29
Infant/Toddler Care	23	39

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 81-86) reported on use of and satisfaction with daycare among civilian spouses (not including single parents or dual career military spouses) in the 1987 ASAF survey. Child care options used varied by the age of the youngest child as follows in that survey:

<u>Options</u>	<u>Ages 0-2</u>	<u>Ages 3-5</u>
Care at home by parents	31% 34% (ENL) 17% (OFF)	22% 24% (ENL) 10% (OFF)
Unlicensed babysitter at parents' home	37%	28%
Licensed on-post family child care home	9%	10%
Child care center on-post	8%	11%
Preschool or nursery school	2%	13%
Off-post child care center	2%	3%

Among those using some form of daycare who had children under six years of age, the following satisfaction ratings were reported: availability of daycare (49%), availability of drop in

daycare (39%), cost of daycare (45%), hours of operation (45%), educational program (58%). Spouses of officers were more satisfied with cost (60% versus 42% for enlisted spouses) and with hours of operation (51% versus 44%). Satisfaction with daycare ratings were generally about 10% lower OCONUS compared to in CONUS.

According to Vernez et al. (1989) 88% of Army families with preschool children used some child care with 52% using at least 10 hours a week. Of those using 10 or more hours a week, 13% placed their child in Army child development center or family day care; 13% used civilian daycare, 41% used private babysitting, 8% used a relative, neighbor, or friend; and 2% used a sibling or self care.

In the RAND survey, soldiers reported placing their preschool child in an average of 36 hours a week day care if they used an Army child development center or family day care; corresponding times for civilian daycare, private babysitting; friend, neighbor, or relative; and sibling/self care were 33, 38, 29, and 26 hours. The percent ratings of only fair to poor service for Army sponsored day care, private babysitting, and civilian daycare, respectively, were 12%, 9%, and 11%.

Children aged six or older were placed in Army child development centers/family day care/on-post youth activities (14%, 13 hours), civilian after school programs (5%, 17 hours), private babysitting (18%, 20 hours); friend/neighbor/relative (10%, 12 hours); older brother or sister (12%, 11 hours), or self care (8%, 12 hours).

Those who placed their children in civilian day care did so for a variety of reasons, as shown below.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Preschoolers</u>	<u>School-age Children</u>
Waiting to get into Army program	15%	7%
Army program not available	10%	15%
Convenience of location	69%	52%
Quality of civilian services	55%	26%
Cost of civilian services	32%	37%

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1922), it was observed

that 27% of families with a child aged 3 to 5 used drop-in child care as did 24% of families with a child of age 1 to 2, and as did 19% of families with a child under one year of age. Fifteen percent of soldiers with a child under 3 years of age used full-day child care, as did 22% of soldiers with a child aged 3 to 5. However, use of full-day child care varied by family type: 31% for dual military couples, 29% for single parent families, and 19% for two-parent (civilian spouse) families. Soldiers (67%) and their spouses (79%) rated the usefulness of full-day child care highly ("very useful"), although the "very useful" ratings were more frequent from child care user soldiers (85%) and spouses (94%) than soldier non-users (66%) and spouse non-users (74%). Soldiers (81%) and spouses (95%) rated drop-in day care as "very useful" more often as users than as soldier non-users (65%) or spouse non-users (77%).

RTI (1990) found that over 90% of soldiers and spouses with children were aware that the Army provides officially sanctioned center and family day care; nearly 50% of those who were aware of such services had used them on-post. Advantages of on-post child care included convenient location (62% of soldiers/38% of spouses), affordable cost (39%/42%), as well as flexible hours and quality care. One apparent disadvantage reported by respondents was a frequent waiting list to enroll one's children.

The 1991 USAREUR family survey found that 66% of all families surveyed had a child care aged child (under 13 years old). Of those families, 41% used some form of child care other than "in home by family," including child development center (15%), family daycare provider (9%), off-post child care center (9%), and in home care by others (8%). It was found that almost half of all child development center users depended on the CDC for their primary child care requirements. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of CDC users felt that the CDC was sensitive to their needs during DESERT STORM. Though most spouses felt that there was no change in their difficulty of finding child care during DESERT STORM (71 - 77%), some (21 - 25%) found it more difficult compared to a few who found it easier (2 - 4%).

Recent surveys (Zellman, Johansen, & Meredith, 1992) of parents using day care suggest that CDCs are rated higher on quality than FDCs. Inflexible hours, sick child policies, and issues concerning administration of medication to recovering children were notable parental concerns about CDCs. Zellman et al. (1992) note that valuable training time is lost by soldiers because of problems in finding child care, both for married couples (average of 3 days per year lost) and single parents (average of 8 days per year lost).

The Army Science Board (1989, p. 23) concluded that the quality of Army child day care was adequate but that the quantity was "woefully inadequate." Other problems raised by soldiers

included (1) occasional home-based day care providers who charge high fees but provide low quality care, (2) active duty mothers who have four weeks maternity leave but cannot put their infant into Army Child Development Centers until six weeks, (3) day care for sick children, and (4) 24 hour a day care for parents with atypical work schedules.

Lakhani & Ardison (1991) found a small relationship (1.5%) between spouse support for officer retention and use of child care.

#### Child abuse services. (ACS)

RTI (1990) found in a telephone survey of soldiers and spouses that between 10% and 20% were aware of family advocacy programs. Family advocacy was cited as a most important ACS program by 10% to 15% of soldiers and spouses.

In the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992) 67% of soldiers and 80% of spouses rated the service as "very useful," although less than two percent of soldiers and spouses reported using child abuse services. More enlisted personnel (1.3%) had used the services than officers (0.33%).

#### Services for handicapped family members. (ACS)

Bonito (1986) in his analysis of 1985 DoD survey data for married soldiers with dependents found relatively high lack of awareness of handicapped programs (57 - 66%), the highest such levels of any of the services reported. Of those who were aware of the programs, the lowest percentage for any service were reported as being available on post (71 - 81%). However, of those who knew of or had used the services, there was only moderate dissatisfaction (8 - 15%) compared to the other services reported.

The 1987 USAREUR (1988) survey nearly 16% of spouses said they had an exceptional family member. Of those, 61% said their member was enrolled in the exceptional family member program. Almost half (47%) of the spouses were satisfied with the medical services available to their family member but 29% were dissatisfied. Satisfaction with community support for the exceptional family member was lower (38%), though dissatisfied responses were also lower (25%). The types of disability varied greatly: 7%, visual; 13%, speech; 6%, hearing; 28%, physical; 4%, mental; 7%, emotional; 10%, behavioral, and 26%, other.

According to Bell (1992b), AFRP data indicate use of services for handicapped family members of only 2-3% of soldiers, regardless of rank, housing location, or geographical region. Presumably percentage use by soldiers who had a handicapped



member at home would be much higher than 2-3%.

RTI (1990 ) found that the exceptional family member program was known by soldiers and spouses as an ACS program but that less than five percent of soldiers or spouses were aware of it. This program was cited as most important by 10% to 15% of soldiers and spouses.

The 1991 USAREUR family survey found 46% of spouses satisfied with community support for exceptional family members compared to 36% in the 1990 USAREUR family survey. However, dissatisfaction remained stable from 1990 to 1991 at 27%, the improvement associated with a decrease in "no opinion" responses. Thirteen percent of families said they had at least one exceptional family member; of those, 84% said they enrolled their member in the USAREUR EFM program. Most families felt that support for EFMs remained the same during DESERT STORM (78 - 87%) though a few thought it became worse (10% of those whose soldier did not deploy; 17% of those whose soldier did deploy).

#### Single parent support groups. (ACS)

Bonito (1986) in his analysis of 1985 DoD survey data for married soldiers found the second lowest levels of awareness of any service for single parent programs (56 - 66% unaware), though those who were aware often identified the programs as being available on post (77 - 88%). However, dissatisfaction levels with the programs were relatively low (5 - 11%).

Nearly ten percent (9.7%) of single parents had used single parent support groups in the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992). In terms of usefulness, 57% of soldiers and 69% of spouses rated this service as "very useful."<sup>10</sup>

#### Special child care for single parents. (CDS)

Devine et al. (1992) from the AFRP survey report that over seven percent of the single parents had used child care for single parents. In terms of usefulness, 62% of soldiers and 72% of spouses rated these services as "very useful."<sup>11</sup>

#### Youth employment programs. (ACS)

Devine et al. (1992) report that in the AFRP survey data ten percent of soldiers with children used youth employment services

---

<sup>10</sup> Devine et al. (1992) fail to present user/non-user results for this service.

<sup>11</sup> Devine et al. (1992) did not report user/non-user usefulness results for these services.



but that of soldiers with children aged 18 or older the use rate was 30%, just a bit above that for soldiers with children between 15 and 17 (26%). Use did not vary substantially by housing location or geographical region. Youth employment services were seen as very useful by soldiers (60%) and spouses (69%), more so among soldier and spouse users (73%/85%) than among non-users (60%/69%).

#### Youth recreation. (Youth Activities)

Zellman et al. (1992) note that youth activities were originally designed to offer organized sports and recreational activities for youth to have a place of their own, but have tended to become "after school care."

According to the 1984 MWR survey (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988), youth activities were used more than 4 hours a week by less than 10% of officers or enlisted personnel with less than 50% of both groups using youth activities even less than 3 or more hours a week. In the same survey, youth activity use was more frequent in OCONUS than in CONUS locations. Youth activity use was reduced by at least 50% for both enlisted and officer personnel living off post, according to Vernez & Tharrington (1988). Officers, as well as married personnel, were more likely than enlisted personnel to use youth activities (Vernez & Tharrington, 1988). The most frequently used activities included swimming, baseball, basketball, soccer, roller skating, gymnastics, arts and crafts, karate, scouting, field trips, dances, carnivals, fourth of July special events, and fairs. Users were fairly satisfied (55%) with few (9%) dissatisfied. The most frequent problems (12 - 13%) concerned equipment and variety of activities.

Bonito (1986) found moderate levels of awareness of Youth Activities programs (only 15 - 32% unaware of them) among married soldiers with dependents in the 1985 DoD survey. Of those who were aware of the programs, most (89 - 94%) identified them as available on post. Dissatisfaction levels appeared to be higher OCONUS (16 - 18%) than in CONUS (6 - 10%).

In the 1987 ASAF survey spouses were asked to identify the most important Youth Activities from among coaching certification, teen clubs, teen high adventure outdoor program, youth athletic peer counseling, youth peer counseling, youth self development classes, youth to youth sponsorship, teen recreation other than sports, and youth employment. The three programs receiving the most frequent selections as most important were teen recreation other than sports (20%), youth employment (20%), and youth self development classes (19%).

Vernez et al. (1989) report RAND survey data on youth activities. Among those using any youth activity, percentages of

soldiers using various types of Army youth activities were found: sports (50%), social activities such as dances and outings (41%), classes of instruction such as ballet, crafts, and swimming (30%), after-school programs (29%), and informal after school activities such as video games, a place to hang out (36%). Those who didn't have children participating gave the following reasons: children not interested (28%), unaware of activities (31%), problems with location or transportation (46%), type of activities/prefer civilian programs (33%), program quality (15%), and cost (17%). Soldiers also rated various aspects of youth activities as only fair to poor: convenience of location (14%), quality of supervision (19%), quality of activities (23%), convenience of hours (20%), and cost (22%).

Use of youth recreation services varied by age of the soldier's child in the AFRP survey (Devine et al., 1992). For soldiers with a child aged 6 to 9 use rate was 36% compared to 46% for soldiers with a child aged 10 to 14. Soldiers with children aged 10 to 18 had use rates of approximately 67%. Soldiers living on-post with a child under ten years of age had slightly higher use rates (79%) than those living off-post with a child of the same age (70%). Use did not vary substantially by geographical region. In terms of percentages of respondents rating youth recreation as "very useful," Devine et al. (1992) report 64% of soldiers and 77% of spouses rating it as such, with soldier (82%) and spouse (90%) users rating it more highly than soldier (62%) and spouse (73%) non-users.

RTI (1990) found that 51% of soldiers and 54% of spouses with children aged 6 - 17 years said their children had participated in Army youth programs. Likewise, 51% of soldiers and 49% of spouses said their children had been involved in youth sports or other youth recreational activities. Relatively few parents reported that their youths had been involved in preteen social activities, trips, summer camps, or youth development programs. Advantages to children of youth programs included camaraderie with other Army children (24% soldiers/36% spouses) as well as opportunities for social development, convenient location, a disciplined environment for children, a chance to learn a sport or develop athletically. A primary advantage for parents was cited as knowing where your children are and that they are well taken care of (44% soldiers/40% spouses). Other advantages for parents included saving money, parents having time for themselves, and a chance to parents to participate in their children's activities.

USAREUR (1991) found that 54% of spouses (with children aged 6 to 19 years) surveyed in their 1991 survey had used the youth services program in USAREUR and of those users 72% said that the program was sensitive to their needs during DESERT STORM.

The Army Science Board (1989, p. 28) observed that Army youth programs have an unexpected benefit, that positive experiences may lead to subsequent recruitment as a substantial percentage of Army youth eventually enlist.

#### Foster care programs.

Griffith et al. (1988, pp. 42-45) reported very low awareness and use of foster care services in their analysis of data from the 1987 ASAF survey.

#### Latchkey programs.

RTI (1990) found that a majority of soldiers (57%) and spouses (67%) recognized the term latchkey. Of them, many (50%/44%) were aware of Army latchkey programs, but only 2% of soldiers used them. However, 39% of soldiers and 50% of spouses with preschool children and who were not using latchkey programs thought that they would do so in the future.

#### Counseling and Treatment Programs. (Multiple Agencies)

##### Drug and alcohol treatment. (Medical Treatment Facilities)

Bonito (1986) analyzed the responses of married soldiers with dependents in the 1985 DoD survey and found very few soldiers were unaware (15% OCONUS, 19 - 25%, in CONUS) of the availability of such programs, compared to other services. An extremely high percentage of soldiers (93 - 96%) who were aware of such programs identified them as being available on post. Dissatisfaction levels were fairly low (8 - 12%) for the alcohol/drug abuse services.

Devine et al. (1992) found from AFRP survey data that 8% of soldiers and 2% of spouses had used drug and alcohol treatment, which was seen as "very useful" by about 67% of soldiers and 75% of spouses. Use did not vary by rank or housing location. Use was slightly greater in Europe (10%) than in other OCONUS locations (6%) or in CONUS (7%) (Bell, 1992b). Interestingly, use of drug and alcohol treatment was negatively related to its perceived usefulness - fewer soldiers who had used the program rated it as "very useful" (59%) than those who hadn't used it (64%), while more users rated it as "not useful" (13%) than non-users (7%), an effect probably related to forced participation in the program by users.

##### Individual Counseling. (Multiple Agencies)

Bonito's (1986) analysis of individual counseling and therapy programs as evaluated by married soldiers in the 1985 DoD survey found that more soldiers were unaware of such programs in CONUS (32 - 35%) than OCONUS (23 - 24%). Of those who were aware

of such programs most identified them as being available on post (88 - 93%). Dissatisfaction levels were fairly low (7 - 12%).

Vernez et al. (1989) present data from the RAND survey on why non-users of treatment programs (who had reported having an emotional problem in the past six months) failed to use Army programs. For the most part, such soldiers and their spouses felt they didn't need the service (50%/49%) or could handle it on their own (31%/23%). However, other reasons were also given by soldiers and their spouses: not sure service was available (5%/7%), lack of availability or access (5%/8%), concerned about (poor) quality (5%/5%), or concerned about confidentiality (4%/8%).

Burnam et al. (1992) using data from the 1987 RAND survey divided counseling programs into two categories - those done by medical personnel (mental health care) and those done by others, such as chaplains, ACS, drug and alcohol counselors, the Red Cross (counseling). They report that 8% of soldiers had used mental health care and 15% counseling within the past six months, averaging seven visits for mental health care and four visits for counseling. Greater use of mental health care was associated with junior enlisted status, female gender, lower emotional well-being, lower education, older age, being stationed in CONUS, not being from a combat unit, and working fewer hours. Greater use of counseling was associated with junior enlisted status, lower emotional well-being, older age, less education, being a single parent or on an unaccompanied tour, and having more dependents.

Martin (1992) reports that 23 to 24% of Army families had experienced emotional or nervous disorders within the past six months in the 1991 Survey of Army Families.

Devine et al. (1992) have reported findings from AFRP data in which 12% of soldiers and 9% of spouses have used individual counseling. Use varied by rank (officers, 5%; enlisted, 13%) but not by housing location. Use varied slightly by geographical location (14%, Europe; 11% other OCONUS and in CONUS). Approximately half of all soldiers and two-thirds of spouses rated individual counseling as "very useful," with about two-thirds of soldiers who had used it giving it such a favorable rating compared to only half of those soldiers who had not used it.

#### Marriage and family therapy. (Multiple Agencies)

Orthner et al. (1985) found that over half of those surveyed were aware of marriage and family therapy services offered on post, but that only about 8% of families had been involved in such counseling. In the 1985 DoD survey, 52% of those who participated in marriage and family counseling reported

satisfaction with the results. Bonito's (1986) analysis of the 1985 DoD survey for married soldiers with dependents found a moderate percentage of soldiers were not aware of marriage and family counseling programs (23 - 24%, OCONUS; 32 - 36%, CONUS), with most programs available on post (87 - 92%). Dissatisfaction levels were a bit higher than for the related services of parent education and premarital counseling (6 - 13%), though it is interesting to note that the lowest levels of dissatisfaction for all three programs were for officers in CONUS.

Devine et al. (1992) from AFRP data report that 8% of soldiers and 10% of spouses had used marriage and family therapy at their installation. While use of this service did not vary by rank or geographical region, it was used more by off-post soldiers (9%) than by on-post soldiers (6%). As might be expected, it was used more by those who reported that their marriages were in trouble sometime within the previous twelve months: 18% for those who had thought their marriage might be in trouble, 21% for those had thought about divorce or separation, 23% for those who had discussed divorce or separation with their spouse, and 24% for those who had filed for divorce or separation. Without citing specific figures, Devine et al. (1992) state that over half of soldiers and approximately two-thirds of spouses reported that they saw this service as "very useful."<sup>12</sup>

#### Family life centers. (Chaplains)

Married soldiers with dependents who participated in the 1985 DoD survey evaluated the availability of family support centers (Bonito, 1986). It was found that OCONUS soldiers were more aware of family support centers (only 15 - 22% unaware of them) than soldiers in CONUS (24 - 34% unaware of them).

Doering & Mahoney (1987) reported on data from the 1985 DoD survey in which soldiers were asked about the availability of family service centers. Unmarried personnel without children rated their availability poorly with only 22% (enlisted) or 23% (officers) reporting good to excellent ratings. Married personnel responded more positively: 51%, enlisted (no children); 56%, enlisted (with children); 51%, officers (no children), and 55%, officers (with children).

#### Marriage enrichment programs. (Multiple Agencies)

Orthner, Early-Adams, & Polluck (1988) cite Orthner, Brody, Hill, Pais, Orthner, & Covi's (1985) Families in Green study at

---

<sup>12</sup> Devine et al. (1992) do not present data on how perceived usefulness of marriage and family therapy might be associated with having used it.

Fort Benning in which it was found that two thirds of couples were aware of marriage enrichment programs but that only 3% had ever participated; most who had participated considered the experience to be valuable.

#### Parent Education Programs. (Multiple Agencies)

Martin (1992) has reported from 1991 Survey of Army Families that 16 to 18% of Army families reported having parenting difficulty within the past six months.

Bonito (1986) reported that a moderate percentage of married soldiers with dependents (30 - 32%, OCONUS; 38 - 43%, CONUS) were not aware of parent education programs in the 1985 DoD survey, though for those who were aware of them most said they were available on post (82 - 91%). Dissatisfaction levels were relatively low (5 - 11%).

The Army Science Board (1989, p. 27) concluded that one program that needed strengthening was that of "training families in the techniques of effective parenting." Programs are offered through chaplains, Family Life Centers, and ACS. The ASB concluded that effective parenting programs would show a positive return on the Army's investment by reducing the stress of parenting on soldiers and their families, thereby improving readiness.

Orthner et al. (1988) cite 1985 DoD Survey of Military Families data in which about half of all parents were aware of parent education programs, though few had used them. At Fort Benning (Orthner et al, 1985) only 6% of parents had received any parent education. Approximately two-thirds of parents who received parent education in both the 1985 DoD survey and Orthner et al.'s (1985) study were satisfied with their programs.

#### Rape counseling. (Multiple Agencies)

Bonito's (1986) analysis of 1985 DoD survey data for married soldiers with dependents placed rape counseling among the top five services of which soldiers were most often unaware (47 - 54%). Of those who were aware of such services at their location, a relatively small percentage placed them on post (78 - 81%, CONUS; 84 - 89%, OCONUS). However, for those with knowledge of or experience with the service, levels of dissatisfaction were uniformly low (6 - 8%).

#### Programs for Single Soldiers

##### Social/recreational Programs (Multiple Agencies)

The Army Science Board (1989, p. 29) found that single



soldiers felt overlooked in the rush to respond to families in the Army. Single soldiers particularly enjoyed MWR leisure and recreational activities.

AFRP data (Devine et al., 1992) show that 14% of single soldiers had used social/recreational programs at their installation. Use was greater for enlisted (approximately 13%) than for officers (4%). On-post soldiers (10%) had used it more than off-post soldiers (4%). About half of soldiers and spouses reported that these programs were "very useful," but Devine et al. (1992) do not present perceptions of usefulness for single soldiers themselves, the more relevant group. Use, at least for all soldiers, was not related to reported usefulness.

#### Premarital counseling. (Multiple Agencies)

Premarital counseling programs were among the top five services of which married soldiers with dependents were most often unaware (54 - 61%) in the 1985 DoD survey (Bonito, 1986). However, dissatisfaction levels were among the lowest of any service analyzed by Bonito (1986) at only 4 - 9% dissatisfied among those who knew of or had experienced the program.

Approximately 4% of soldiers and spouses reported having used premarital counseling at their installation (Devine et al., 1992) in the AFRP survey. Use was not related to rank, housing location, or geographical region. Single soldiers who were involved in a serious relationship were more likely (5%) to have used premarital counseling than single soldiers who were not so involved (2%). About half of all soldiers and spouses indicated that they felt premarital counseling was "very useful," but there was no apparent relationship between use and perceived usefulness.